# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT....WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 5. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1852. WHOLE NO. 629.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, Two DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.


## Selections.

### DEVELOPMENT OF PRO-SLAVERY QUAKERISM.

We have a somewhat remarkable story to tell our readers the present week, and, as the incidents are mostly of a personal nature, we shall use the perpendicular pronoun instead of the editorial plural.

Some three years ago, for reasons which at that time were satisfactory to my own mind, I became a member of that branch of the Society of Friends popularly termed Hicksite. After my removal to Salem, Ohio, a certificate of my membership was forwarded to the Monthly Meeting in that place, by which it was received in the usual form. In consequence of my Anti-Slavery position, and of my warm interest in other reforms, I was soon afterwards subjected to violent and bitter persecution by the pro-slavery party in the Ohio Yearly Meeting. The majority of the Salem Monthly Meeting, finding in me no cause of offence, could not be made the instruments for carrying out the measures by which the pro-slavery bigots in other localities sought to banish me from the Society. The latter being thus baffled, and finding no discipline to answer their purposes, adopted a system of ecclesiastical lynch law, which was pursued without much success up to the time that I left the State, about one year ago. What has happened since, I am not able precisely to state, but I have no reason to doubt that the Salem Monthly Meeting is still in existence, and that my name stands recorded on its books as a member. Certainly I have never been disowned, nor has any complaint ever been preferred against me, or entertained by that meeting. I therefore regard my right of membership in the Society as unimpeached and unimpeachable. I could readily have obtained a certificate of removal from Salem Monthly Meeting, but, owing to the peculiar state of the Society here, I have preferred hitherto that my right should not be transferred.

So much for preliminaries: and now for my story. After the close of the Woman's Rights Convention at West Chester, I went to East Marlborough and vicinity on a visit to my friends. As was quite natural, I went with some of those friends to the Marlborough meeting on First day. A friend who knew beforehand my prospect of attendance, had taken occasion, from his own interest in the fact, to make a public announcement of that prospect in the Convention. While I did not anticipate such a notice, I had, on my own account, no objection to it.

Upon my arrival at the Marlborough meeting-house on First day morning, I was met in the yard by a stranger, whose dress gave no indication that he was a Friend, and who expressed, in a somewhat flurried manner, a desire to speak with me in private. I stepped aside with him, when he introduced himself as James T. House. He proceeded to say that if I attempted to "impose" myself on the meeting, there would be a disturbance, and that I should have to suffer the consequences. Knowing that the meeting was composed of two parties, each claiming an equal right to the house, I naturally inferred that the individual who thus rudely addressed me was a partizan, whose impertinent zeal had over-mastered his discretion. I said very little to him, but immediately walked into the house in company with Eusebius Barnard and J. A. Dugdale, and at their request took a seat between them on the only bench that remained empty. That seat was in the gallery.

Soon after the meeting became settled, William Lloyd, of Bucks Co., and Sarah Pierson, of Hamorton, spoke briefly but impressively. My own mind being impressed with the promise of Jesus to his disciples, that where two or three should be gathered together in his name, he would be in their midst to bless them, I rose for the purpose of giving expression to the thoughts which the contemplation of that promise had awakened. No party feelings stirred my mind. I was conscious of no emotion whatever inconsistent with the solemnity that befitted the time and the place, and felt that I had a message of love and good-will to all. I began thus: "It was the promise of Jesus to his disciples"—but before these words were fairly uttered, a man whom I did not know, but who afterwards proved to be Humphrey Marshall, one of the Elders of the meeting, rose, and, in an excited manner, inquired if the individual speaking was Oliver Johnson. I stood silent, but some one in the audience answered the question in the affirmative. Humphrey Marshall then, in a tone of voice which appeared to me exceedingly harsh and peremptory, requested me to take my seat and not to disturb the harmony of the meeting. After standing silent for a moment, I obeyed the impression which impelled me again to speak. I began, "It was the promise of Jesus to his"—but before I could utter another word, Humphrey Marshall again rose, and, in a loud and angry tone, bade me sit down or leave the house. Others of his party responded in a similar manner. Meanwhile I stood silent. Humphrey Marshall then said, as near as I can recollect, "I appoint John Huey and Thomas W. Parker to take him out." Those individuals then rose and approached me. They seized me by the wrists with the apparent intention of executing the order of those whose tools they had consented to be; but power did not seem to be given them to perform the deed of violence and shame. I sat down, and, as I did so, their hands relinquished their hold, and they went back to their seats. Humphrey Marshall, finding the courage of his chosen tools inadequate to the execution of his order, next called upon Constable McNutt to remove me. As the officer rose to approach me, cries of 'shame!' 'shame!' were heard from every part of the house, which made him hesitate. Eusebius Barnard and others protested against such disgraceful conduct in a meeting of Friends, and expressed the belief that the officer could not legally remove me without a warrant. It was plain from the officer's manner, that the scene before him was not such an one as the representations of his employers had led him to anticipate. He saw that the parties whom it was sought to overawe by his official presence were not rowdies bent on mischief and disturbance, but serious and conscientious men, who sought to exercise what they felt to be their legal, moral and disciplinary rights in a peaceable manner. Though assured by Humphrey Marshall and his coadjutors in the work of violence, that they would indemnify him if the removal proved to be illegal, he yielded to his better feelings and sat down without laying even a finger upon me.

The meeting afterwards became quiet, but after such a scene of confusion and tumult, I felt myself relieved from the impression under which I rose at first, and therefore remained silent until the party which had sought my expulsion shook hands and left the house. Quite a number of Friends, during the scene above described, expressed a desire that I might be permitted to proceed. Among those who did so were Jonathan Lamborne and James Meredith, the latter having for many years been head Elder in the meeting.

After the party in favour of violence had retired, the rest of the meeting, embracing more than half the number in attendance, remained together for a short time and listened to brief testimonies from Joseph A. Dugdale and myself.

On Second day morning, I went from Marlborough to West Chester with my wife and friends, to take the cars for Philadelphia. While seated in Simon Barnard's parlour, Constable Wallings called and very politely informed me that he had a warrant from Henry Fleming, Justice of the Peace, for my arrest upon a charge of disturbing Friends' meeting at Marlborough on the day previous. The detention was a serious inconvenience to me, for business at home demanded my presence; but pro-slavery Quakerism, when it seizes the sword of temporary power, does not take account of such trifles. I went at once to the magistrate's office, where my friend Simon Barnard became responsible for my appearance at any hour during the day when I might be wanted. The officer of the law informed me that I was not to receive the honours of this martyrdom, such as it was, alone; but that Hiram Hall, Vincent Barnard, Dr. Bartholomew Fussell, Eusebius Barnard and William Barnard (the last two are ministers of the Society), were included in the complaint. The guilt of these men consisted in their rising, and in a calm and dignified manner protesting against the proposition to remove me by force from the house. With the exception of Hiram Hall, they are all Friends, and they spoke in the exercise of what they deemed their just rights as men and members of the Society. Not an unkind or an undignified word escaped their lips. Their demeanour was such as became men making a Christian profession. They said not a word until after the disturbance caused by the appeal to force, and then only in grief and quiet submission to whatever might follow.

The persons who entered the complaint were the same that had undertaken the work of removing me from the meeting, but had not found their courage equal to the task. Their names were John Huey and Thomas W. Parker—the latter being more familiarly known, I understand, as *Tom* Parker. He certainly has very small claims to the name of Friend. John Huey, I was informed, was not long since, if he is not now, the owner of a rum tavern, the rent of which probably finds its way to his pocket. His temperance character may be inferred from the statement made to me by a reputable citizen, that within the last two years he rode through the township in which he resides to procure votes in favour of licensing the sale of intoxicating drinks. I was also informed that he had been more noted heretofore for his attendance on sleighing and dancing parties than for those graces which are usually regarded as the evidences of personal piety. He formerly attended Friends' meeting but rarely, but since the spirit of bigotry and violence became rampant in Marlborough, his zeal in favour of public worship has, we are told, been sensibly quickened. Worthy men were these to become the tools of that sort of Quakerism, which, having no confidence in the power of truth, and being destitute of the patience and forbearance which were so beautifully exemplified by the founders of the Society, grasps the sword and seeks to accomplish its measures by an appeal to the law of violence.

About two o'clock, P. M., the other prisoners (with the exception of Hiram Hall) having arrived, I was summoned to the office of Justice Fleming and at once put upon trial. William Darlington appeared as counsel for the prosecution. I thought it best to defend myself. The witnesses brought forward by the prosecution were Thomas W. Parker, James T. House, Richard M. Barnard, Benjamin Parker, and Isaac H. Bailey. Perhaps there were one or two others, whose names have escaped me. The story they told contradicted in no essential particular the statement I have made above, except that they were somewhat more emphatic than their information warranted in their denial of my right to membership in the Society. As they evidently knew nothing on the subject, silence would have been more creditable to them. They of course claimed that the party to which they belonged were the only Simon Pures—that they constituted the only meeting in Marlboro' that was entitled to the name of Friends—that the others were only a set of outlaws and disorderly persons.

When I came to cross-examine them however, they were compelled to admit, that there were two meetings, each claiming an equal right in the house. They admitted that there was no rule of discipline forbidding me to speak, even on the assumption that I was not a member; and also that there was no rule conferring upon the Elders any authority to forbid my speaking. They admitted, moreover, that they had never known another instance of a stranger being thus stopped from speaking by a threat of removal from the house. They made a merit of testifying that my demeanor was courteous and gentlemanly and that I made use of no exciting or improper language. They said there was nothing either in my manner or my words calculated in the least degree to disturb the solemnity of the meeting.

The testimony for the prosecution being closed, I was called upon for my defence. I stated to the magistrate that I had been suddenly arrested, in a community to which I was a stranger, upon a charge affecting my reputation as a peaceable and orderly citizen; that until I had heard the evidence in support of the charge I was not able to see what would be requisite for my defence, and that I now perceived it to be necessary to call several witnesses who were not and could not be present on that day. I therefore asked for a postponement. To this reasonable request, William Darlington, in a heartless and ungentlemanly manner, objected, saying, among other things, that I was an "interloper," and that a man who went about disturbing religious meetings was bound to be always ready to produce his witnesses. He therefore urged the magistrate to go on with the case at once. I remonstrated against this as unjust, and appealed both to the magistrate and to William Darlington to allow me a fair opportunity to make my defence. I reminded them that a postponement could not injuriously affect the prosecution, if it should be proved that their complaint was well founded, while to me it was a matter of importance. William Darlington, notwithstanding his unmanly allusion to me as an "interloper," said that he would only ask the magistrate to impose upon me a fine of $5, the smallest sum which the law allowed! but he was in a great hurry to have the matter decided, evidently apprehending that if I should be allowed further time for my defence, his chance for mulcting me even in that small amount would be rather slim.

I took my seat to await the decision of the magistrate upon the motion for postponement, intending, of course, if that motion should be decided against me, to enter at once upon my defence. There were at least six or eight witnesses that I intended to examine, after which I should have claimed the right to address the magistrate and to show that I had not been guilty, in any legitimate sense of the word, of any disturbance of the meeting, but had acted in harmony with the discipline and the usage of the Society. No sooner, however, had I closed my appeal to the magistrate upon the preliminary motion, than he said: "I presume some of the party accused will be proved guilty; I will therefore fine you $5 and costs." This before I had called a single witness or uttered one word of my defence! I confess I was astounded, and it certainly was no wonder that a murmur of indignation ran through the room. I noticed that the magistrate, during the examination of the witnesses, instead of giving his attention to the matter before him, had his eye fixed intently upon the pages of an almanac that lay upon the desk. He doubtless thought it a small matter to deprive a stranger, and an Abolitionist, of his rights, especially as that seemed the quickest way to get rid of the subject. He was like the Dutch Judge, of whom it is related that he never heard but one of the parties to a suit, because, as he affirmed, it always bothered and confused him to listen to both sides!

When I expressed my astonishment at his conduct, and denounced it as unprecented and tyrannical, Justice Fleming graciously said he would suspend judgment until I had made my defence; but after reflection and consultation with two or three friends, I declined an offer which I could regard in no other light than as a mockery and insult. I told him plainly that I had a defence which I did not doubt would be entirely satisfactory to an *impartial* magistrate, but that it did not consist with my sense of self-respect to offer it to one who had already pronounced judgment. I therefore offered him the money to discharge the fine and costs. The witnesses for the prosecution, as if ashamed of themselves, declined taking the customary fee, and William Darlington made some patronizing remarks, the benefit of which I declined, informing him that I did not ask his pity or sympathy.

Thus the matter ended, so far as I was concerned. The $5.55 that I paid was taken from my pocket by a process a great deal meaner than stealing; but if the prosecutors and the magistrate are satisfied with their share of the transaction, I certainly shall not grumble at mine. It was worth all it cost thus to develope the spirit of violence which exists in some of those who assume to be the leaders in the Society of Friends. This disclosure will do a great deal of good, by opening the eyes of many to the true state of the Society.

I ought to state, what the reader will perhaps have already inferred, that the plan for my expulsion and arrest was deliberately settled beforehand (under the advice of William Darlington) by a caucus held at the house of Richard M. Barnard. William Darlington evidently went into the business *con amore*, sinking, without hesitation, the man in the lawyer. An honourable and high-minded attorney would have advised a peaceable and fraternal settlement of the questions at issue between the parties, but he did not hesitate to fan the flame of discord and involve a whole neighbourhood in a legal quarrel as disgraceful as it is contrary to every principle of Christianity. His conduct in refusing his assent to a postponement, to enable me to make my defence, was extremely unfair, and showed him deficient in that nice sense of honour which is an essential element in a true manly character.

The five other culprits (!) are to be tried to-day at West Chester. I intend to be there to see what comes of the affair. Not being used to public speaking, they have reluctantly employed counsel. Joseph J. Lewis will manage their cause, and will no doubt do it with skill.

—I shall make no apology for presenting to the readers of *The Freeman* this personal narrative, because the persecution thus waged against me and those associated with me, however it may be disguised under other pretences, is after all a development of the pro-Slavery spirit which exists to a lamentable extent in the Society of Friends. It is my position as an Abolitionist and a Reformer that makes me an object of the deepest aversion and hostility on the part of the pharisaical clique who are seeking to rule that Society. I have no personal ends to advance in making this exposition. My only desire is to promote the cause of Freedom and Humanity by doing what I can to counteract the spirit of intolerance and persecution that reigns in the bosoms of those who are aiming their deadliest stabs at the cause of the slave under the guise of a religious profession—*Pa. Freeman.*

---

The conclusion of this remarkable trial is thus reported by the (West Chester) *Register & Examiner*. The evidence, it will be seen, entirely confirms the statement, published above, of Oliver Johnston:

THE MARLBOROUGH MEETING DISTURBANCE.

We gave a brief account of the proceedings of the above case in our last paper. Without concluding, it will be remembered, the hearing was adjourned until last Saturday.

From the general interest manifested in the case, it was evident that the magistrate's office would not be adequate to contain more than a small portion of those likely to be in attendance.

The Hall of the Cabinet was accordingly opened, and at the time the examination commenced (two o'clock) it was well filled, and continued to be so throughout the hearing.

Many were present from the neighbourhoods of Marlborough and Kennett Square, and not a few from the borough, the latter being principally attracted by the novelty of the proceeding.

We attended, and committed the whole of the evidence to writing, with the intention of making an impartial synopsis from it. Upon further consideration, however, we determined to present the testimony of several witnesses entire, with an occasional expurgation of sentences wholly pertaining to matters not at issue.

We would cheerfully have accorded to the request of many of our friends and patrons, and published the evidence entire, did not the lateness of the week make this impracticable, or the repetition of the same facts by a number of witnesses render it useless.

Most of the omitted testimony was fully equal in point of clearness, and interest, to any here given, but our time and space precludes the possibility of its admission. All the witnesses examined were on the part of the defence.

*D. McNutt (Constable) affirmed.*—Attended Marlborough Meeting at request of Thos. W. Parker. He called at my home, distant from Marlborough Meeting House about two miles. He said he was advised by the attorneys to ask me to go there that day. He said that Oliver Johnson was to be at meeting, or to speak there, and that they did not consider that he had any right to speak there.

I went to the Meeting House on Sunday morning last about 10 o'clock. I took a seat among the congregation. Oliver Johnson got up, I suppose, to preach. When he began, Humphrey Marshall ordered him to take his seat. He stopped speaking when Marshall spoke to him. He commenced again, and stopped again when spoken to a second time. He commenced a third time, when Marshall ordered John Huey and Thomas Parker to take him from the house. He spoke no complete sentence. Thomas Parker and John Huey stepped up to him, laid hold of his arms, and requessed him to go out of the Meeting House. They took hold of him. He rather hung back: but did not seem to resist much, and they then called upon me to take him out. I then went up. He was standing, but not saying anything. I did not take hold of him. There was a good deal of noise on both sides. Some urged me to take him out, and others said I had no authority to take him out. I stood there a bit, and then I sat down by the side of Joseph Dugdale. Johnson said no more while I was in the meeting. I staid there until I supposed they broke the meeting.

Several of them, I can't tell who they are, said I had no right to take him out. Think Eusebius Barnard said that he had been informed that I had no right to arrest a man without a warrant.

The meeting was quiet until Mr. Johnson got up to speak. A man and woman had already spoken.

I suppose I was called on for the purpose of arresting Mr. Johnson. I am not in the habit of going to that meeting.

I don't know of any breach of the peace on Mr. Johnson's part. He got up as another preacher.

The warrant I afterwards had contained the name of Hiram Hall. I was informed that Hall was gone to Delaware county, and did not go to his house. I got no directions not to go from Thomas Parker. I was told not to go by George Martin, but do not know if he had a right in the matter.

Cross-examined.—William Barnard rose to his feet when I went up to Johnson. Eusebius Barnard told me I had no right to arrest him without a warrant. I do not know that Vincent Barnard was on his feet. I saw Dr. Fussell on his feet. Heard clapping of hands from one female. Think it was Sarah Pearson. Hiram Hall said to me, I am a friend of yours, and if you are a friend of mine, do not touch that man. Dr. Fussell lives within half a mile of old Kennett. H. Hall also resides near another meeting house. There was a large collection of people. There was people there from a distance—from Kennett. When I came out, a good many of the neighbours residing near the Meeting House came out.

I attended a Quaker meeting when I was small. I never saw proceedings of this kind in a Quaker meeting before. The noise was from both parties. The moment I stepped into the gallery, some persons cried shame, shame.

Re-Examined.—I heard nothing to interrupt the usual performance of a Quaker meeting, until Humphrey Marshall ordered Johnson to take his seat. I had no warrant put into my hands against Sarah Pearson.

Humphrey Marshall and Richard M. Bernard, broke the meeting. Eusebius Bernard, Oliver Johnson, J. A. Dugdale, Jonathan Lamborn and myself were in the gallery at the time. There were persons sitting on the three gallery benches fronting the meeting. On the lower one of them, and on the seat facing the gallery, the persons sat who first commenced shaking hands.

*James Meredith, affirmed.*—I shall be 84 years of age if I live until the 4th day of 9th month next. I am a member of the Society of Friends, and have been all my life, except the time when the Orthodox disowned me. They served me as they served all others of the same opinion. I belong to Marlborough particular meeting. I suppose I am considered an elder (Mr. Darlington requested an explicit answer, yea or nay). Answer—I am. Eusebius and myself have for a great many years been in the habit of closing that meeting.

I did not forbid Oliver Johnson to speak last First day. I requested the constable to let him alone. When Oliver Johnson rose to his feet, Humphrey Marshall forbid him at once before he had uttered a sentence. He inquired whether it was Oliver Johnson, and did not know who it was until he was told, Humphrey Marshall's opposing Oliver Johnson's speaking was the moving cause of the disturbance in the meeting. I should think Humphrey Marshall's conduct in opposing him very irregular. He did not know what he might say, as he did not wait until he had uttered a sentence.

Eusebius Barnard has usually sat at the head of that meeting. He is an approved minister of the Society. Wm. Barnard also frequently speaks. Joseph A. Dugdale is a minister of the Society. He brought his certificate, and I think it was stated he was a minister. He has been in the habit of frequently addressing the meeting. Eusebius Barnard, William Barnard and J. A. Dugdale have always been acceptable to me as ministers. I was quite willing to hear Oliver Johnson last First day, and did hear him after some of them went out, and I was well satisfied with what he said. The greatest number remained in the house, when some withdrew, and some of those who went out remained about the doors to hear what was said.

I think the greater part of the neighbours staid in the house. I belong to the Kennett Monthly Meeting. I can't say that there was anything in the conduct of Eusebius Barnard, William Barnard, or Dr. Fussell, calculated to disturb the harmony of the meeting.

Jos. A. Dugdale, when he came to reside among us, brought his certificate. From that time he has sat in the minister's gallery. I invited him to sit by Eusebius Barnard. There was quite as much division in the Society before Jos. A. Dugdale came to reside among us, as since.

All that has been done, relative to the disownment of those friends was entirely out of the order of the Society.

Cross-examined—I have not been relieved from eldership. I have not attached myself to a party who have laid down the office of elder. They have elders in meetings. I think I have met with others in London Grove to transact business. I have met at different times with others. I think we met sometimes on particular occasions on week days. There may have been some business transactions on one First day William Barnard was clerk of that meeting. We have a monthly meeting. Held a quarterly meeting at Kennett Square. It is not long since we had the quarterly meeting. We sent delegates to the yearly meeting. I think I have understood they were not received by that meeting. There has been no new yearly meeting established. We have separated from others. Eusebius Barnard, Vincent Barnard, Wm. Barnard, Dr. Fussell, Jonathan Lamborn, and a number of others. Several of these belonged to Marlborough meeting. Eusebius Barnard was disowned, if it is called a disownment; and I can prove the proceedings were not regular. Dr. Fussell has been an attendant at Marlborough for the last two weeks. He left Kennett Square because he was treated unkindly by a few.

Jos. A. Dugdale came from Ohio. When his certificate was presented, the Clerk, Richard M. Barnard, left the meeting in session, and took the books with him. This was last summer. Because Richard went off with the books, we appointed Simon Barnard. The meeting did not break up when Richard went away. I should not think a majority of the members went with him. They had been in the habit of opposing Joseph without a cause. He had been in the habit of attending the meetings of business before that time. His claim to be received had been rejected as often as presented. He persisted in attending the meetings, and speaking to the business. It was not until after that Richard took the books away. Since that time Joseph has been in the habit of attending the business meetings, and speaking to business. He has sometimes been requested to desist. That party have not received him into membership. We have.

In answer to questions by Mr. Hickman.—I do not know that there has been much said about who shall not speak in meeting. I will allow any good man to speak—would allow thee, if thee was good. I would allow a Methodist. Have never known until latterly any person who is not a member, speaking in meeting. Don't know any person wearing a blue coat, with velvet collar and lapels, such as Oliver Johnson had on when speaking. I don't care anything about the clothes. I don't know that I ever knew any one who uses the terms Sir and Mister to speak in Friends' meeting.

When *Esther Hayes* was called to the stand, she declined being affirmed, and stated she would tell the truth without. She was permitted to proceed.

I have belonged to the Society since my birth—am an elder. I was clerk of the quarterly meetings. I reside in Newlin township. I was in Ohio some time back. Knew Jos. A. Dugdale—knew Oliver Johnson. Knew them before I went there. Oliver Johnson was recognised as a member of Friends' meeting in Salem. Oliver took part in meetings of business—spoke in meetings of worship.

Cross-examined.—Oliver Johnson did not come to Ohio from one of the New England States. He was understood to have gone to Ohio from New York. The Society he was attached to in New York was not of the Congregational Society of Friends.

He brought a certificate to Salem, and it was received. Perhaps it was the understanding that it was from a Congregational meeting. I was not aware that his case was taken up to the Yearly meeting. I do not think it was. The higher meeting has nothing to do with receiving certificates. The monthly meeting is the executive in this matter. He spoke sometimes. He was not a recommended minister. Persons speak who are not recommended ministers, and very acceptably. The monthly meeting always receives the certificates. I left Ohio about two years ago. Johnson left about one year ago, I heard.

Re-examined.—According to the usages and discipline of the Society, the monthly meetings always decide on the reception of certificates.

Re-cross-examined.—I consider Oliver dressed plainly now. He was dressed when he spoke in Ohio about as he is now. He did not say Sir or Mister to me.

*Oliver Johnson, affirmed.*—I went from Junius Monthly Meeting, in the State of New York, to Salem Monthly Meeting, in Ohio. Junius Monthly Meeting belonged to the Genessee Yearly Meeting. It was not at that time, nor had it then been, a congregational meeting. The congregational meetings are independent bodies, and only regard larger bodies as advisory. The Junius Monthly Meeting did afterwards, as I subsequently understood, organize upon an independent congregational basis.

While I resided in Ohio, I was several times appointed upon Committees, and upon one occasion was appointed a representative to the Quarterly Meeting; I also attended the Yearly Meeting and took part in its proceedings without any objections. I was frequently in the habit of speaking in the meetings of worship in Ohio. I ought to observe, that when I received my certificate from the Junius Monthly Meeting, from the divided state of the Society, and the position I held as an Abolitionist, I hesitated whether it would be wise in me to present it to the Salem Monthly Meeting. I finally concluded that if the meeting would harmoniously and unitedly receive me, I should be glad to belong to them. I therefore laid the certificate upon the Clerk's table of the Salem Monthly Meeting. It was received without objection from any quarter. I subsequently understood that there was a regret expressed on the part of a few persons that the certificate had been received. I therefore addressed a letter to the monthly meeting, asking that meeting to reconsider the question of the reception of the certificate, stating that I had heard of such objections, and that unless they could receive me harmoniously, without making a division among them, I desired them to return the certificate to me. I was present at the meeting when the letter was read. I requested that friends, if they had any objections to my reception, to state them, and told them if any explanations were wanted, I was willing to give them. The meeting a second time received the certificate without objection from any quarter. There have never been any disciplinary steps taken with regard to myself since that day, to my knowledge, and I regard myself as a member, and entitled to all the immunities and privileges of a member of the Society of Friends.

I did not contemplate or anticipate that any disorder would have occurred, or I should not have gone to Marlborough meeting. But I do not wish it to be understood that I regret going there. I went into the gallery by invitation of Eusebius Barnard. I frequently sat in the gallery in Ohio. I was frequently asked to set there by the elders of the monthly meeting.

Cross-examined.—The case of the reception of my certificate was taken to the Ohio Yearly Meeting, but not by any legitimate way. A small faction of the meeting, at its close, after most of the members had left, took the matter up. This faction of the Yearly Meeting directed the clerk of the Salem Monthly Meeting, to expunge the reception of my certificate from the books. It reached the yearly meeting through the meeting of sufferings, which had no authority in the matter.

I am not aware of but one organisation of the Ohio Yearly Meeting. They directed the minute to be expunged, and the Salem Monthly Meeting refused to comply, because the Yearly Meeting had no authority to give the direction.

I think my certificate was dated about three years ago. I attended a conference of the Congregational Friends about the date of the certificate in common with many recognised Friends, among whom was Lucretia Mott.

No person invited me to attend the meeting at Marlborough. I informed Joseph A. Dugdale of my intention, and he gave it out at the Women's Rights Convention.

I am not aware that there was no Junius Monthly Meeting in New York.

In answer to questions by Mr. Hickman, Mr. Johnson said—When I spoke in Ohio, I dressed as I do now. I spoke the same language. I used the the term Mister and Sir. I was brought up to the use of the common language, and never attached any importance to it.

When I spoke in Ohio, I did it in the exercise of my rights of a lay member, and not as a recommended minister.

Re-examined—There was no appeal from the Act of the Salem Monthly Meeting in receiving me as a member. The Yearly Meeting had no right to exercise the right they claimed. There is no precedent for it—no similar case.

The greater part of the body left before the action of the meeting in my case was had. I have never joined any congregational meeting. I have attended meetings not disciplinary.

The defendants closed at twenty-five minutes past 8 o'clock.

Mr. Hickman addressed the magistrate against the part of the prosecution, read the Act under which proceedings were instituted, reviewed the testimony as to the fact of the disturbance and by whom it was created.

The following is the Act:

"That from and after the passage of this act, if any person or persons shall be guilty of disturbing any congregation, society or meeting, assembled for the purpose of religious worship, or assembled for the purpose of transacting any business pertaining to religious worship; or if any person or persons shall be guilty of encouraging, aiding, or in any way countenancing any such disturbance, on conviction thereof before any judge, justice of the peace, or alderman of the proper city or county wherein the offence shall be committed, shall pay a fine of not less than five dollars, nor more than fifty dollars and costs, at the discretion of the judge, justice or alderman trying the same, for the use of the city, township or borough wherein the offence shall be committed. If any person or persons convicted and fined for disturbing any meeting, as aforesaid, shall neglect or refuse to pay the fine and costs imposed upon him, her or them, it shall be the duty of the judge, justice or alderman trying the same, to make out a mittimus, directed to any constable in the county wherein such offence shall be committed, committing the persons so offending to the jail of the proper county; and it is hereby made the duty of the person having the charge of such jail, to receive and keep such person or persons in close confinement till the amount of the fine and costs are fully paid and discharged."

The points taken by Mr. Lewis in his argument, were:

1. That the law of 1847 under which the defendants were proceeded against, was in violation of that provision of the constitution which guaranteed to the citizen, that trial by jury should be as heretofore, and the right therefore remain inviolate. He stated that the offence of disturbing religious meetings was amply remedied at common law by indictment, and that it had never been made subject to summary proceedings prior to the act of 1847, by which the legislature had attempted to give the powers which before had belonged only to courts and juries, to a justice of the peace. This he urged the legislature were incompetent to do.

2. That supposing the act to be constitutional, it had no application to such a case as that in hand, the object of the act being to secure religious meetings from malicious disturbance by ill-disposed persons from without, and not to interfere between persons claiming to exercise their rights as members of the church. He insisted that the Act was intended as a shield for the protection of them who wish to enjoy in peace their religious privileges, and not as a sword with which each or either of two contending parties in a disordered church could arm themselves, and wound and destroy one another.

3. That the difference between the parties related to their civil rights, both claiming to be Friends of the Hicksite connection, and both acting fairly and conscientiously upon a belief that they were entitled as members of a religious society to worship in their accustomed place of meeting, according to the established usages of the society; that the defendants have done nothing which they might not lawfully do if their claim was well founded—and that it was enough for the parties to know that the claim existed, that it was adhered to, and maintained in good faith, and that even if mistaken in their opinion as to the validity of their claim (which the speaker did not admit), the defendants were not subject to the penalties of the law, nor to be hunted down as criminals.

4. That even if the occasion was one for the summary interference of the Justice, which it was not, the prosecutors and their party were the real offenders and not the defendants.

He concluded by observing that the defendants took their defence upon principle, and that he would inform the Justice that that officer might be apprised of the responsibilities of his position, that no fine, large or small, that he might impose would be paid by either of the defendants. They would submit to imprisonment of any length and of any severity rather than yield one jot or one tittle of what they believed to be their rights.

Mr. Darlington controverted these views. He contended that the act under which the proceedings were brought was strictly constitutional. At any rate, he did not suppose a Justice of the Peace would feel himself called upon to pronounce an Act of Assembly unconstitutional, when it is well known that the Judges of the Courts of Common Pleas invariably treat all laws as constitutional, leaving their unconstitutionality to be determined by the highest Court.

That this was one of the precise cases in which the act in question, and that the more outrageous conduct was prevented by more severe remedies, by indictment in the Quarter Sessions.

That the position of the counsel for the defendant, that the law was not intended to apply to a case of disputed rights was unsound, as these defendants had no rights in the property, having been regularly disowned from all membership with the Society. That if they were not satisfied with the acts of the Monthly Meeting, their remedy was to appeal to the higher tribunals of the church, and not persist in thrusting themselves forward in the manner they had done. That failing to appeal, they had, to all intents and purposes, acquiesced in the decision. That he presumed an honourable and impartial Justice would not swerve from his duty by any threat the counsel for the defence might be authorized to make. That he had a plain duty before him, and it was not for those who had rendered themselves amenable to the law to rid themselves of the consequences of their acts, by declarations that they would suffer imprisonment before they would pay the fines imposed.

The Justice will defer judgment until Saturday next, at 2 o'clock.

To this we add some further testimony, which we find in another paper:

*Moses Pennock* was affirmed. Was an elder until he requested a release. (His testimony was pretty much corroborative of the above.) It was Dr. Fussell told the constable he could not arrest Johnson without a warrant; knew there was difficulty at Marlborough. When the Clerk, Richard M. Barnard, withdrew, we organized another meeting and opened another set of books, sent a report to Monthly meeting; it was refused—formed a quarterly meeting, and sent a report to yearly meeting; it was refused; they had all been disowned; somebody said they had learned from counsel learned in law that they could not make arrest without a warrant; heard Dr. Fussell say so.

*James Mott*, affirmed. Testified to the rules of the meeting; never knew a person to be interrupted before the nature of his discourse was developed; was near 64 years old—lives in Philadelphia. There is a division in the Society of Friends throughout the Union—cause, the progressive movement of the age and the conservative, involving the Slavery question; has known Methodist and Baptist preachers to speak in Friends meeting, when moved by the spirit, though it was unusual; it is considered right for any one to come into Friends meeting and speak—can speak at all times. (When asked if a Locofoco would be permitted to speak, it brought him to his senses, and he replied that he didn't say there was liberty to speak any kind of doctrine at any time.

*Benjamin Pyle*, affirmed, said that James Meredith cried 'shame, shame'—said they talked about disturbing the solemnities of the meeting, and I said, "you talk about disturbing the solemnities of the meeting, but I call it Belzebub."

*Isaac Mendenhall*, affirmed, said there was a lady clapped once—thought it the result of nervousness.

*John Valentine*, affirmed, didn't see anything in the conduct of that meeting at all different to what we have had in many other meetings.

---

STANTON'S DECLINE AND FALL.—The annals of no faction present an example of more shameful apostacy than has been exhibited by ex-senator Stanton. Commencing his career as a student in Lane Seminary by an Abolition bolt, and participating in the stampede caused by the opposition of the Faculty to the students' Anti-Slavery Society, he at once secured a high place in the Anti-Slavery conventicles. After that, for years a lecturer and stump speaker for the Liberty Party, contending that it was a grievous sin to vote for a slaveholder, and that both the old parties were irremediably pro-slavery and hopelessly pro-slavery, he was regarded as the model young man in the political world. Wearing no chains and spurning all bribes, the political integrity of Stanton was more than spartan. Petted, caressed and made notorious by the Abolition influence and organization, he joined the Buffalo party in 1848, let himself down into the coalition of 1849, and received his thirty pieces of silver in the shape of an election to the State Senate.

In 1852 we find him, the proscribed, hunted and mobbed Abolitionist of 1835, the then colleague of Garrison, Quincy and Weld, admitted within the sacred precincts of Tammany Hall. Henry B. Stanton and Captain Rynders, says a telegram, addressed the Democracy, pledging their support to the Baltimore nominations and the platform, and were received with tumultuous applause!

Whence this change? Stanton and Rynders—twin exponents of the moral and religious Liberty Party and Free Soil creed! That Tammany Hall, from which even William Leggett was excluded, thrown wide open to the pestilent agitator! Were William Leggett alive, his indignant denunciations would be hurled with no sparing hand on the head of Stanton and his fellow apostates.

Lamentable as these developements are, they serve more clearly to illustrate the *swindle* which was perpetrated in 1848 and 9, by the Van Burens, Nyes and Preston Kings, of the first part, and the Henry B. Stantons and Joshua Leavitts, of the second, whereby the *voting* Abolitionists were, for a consideration sold, assigned, transferred and set over to the Locofoco pro-slavery party.—*Madison County Journal.*

---

HON. ROBERT RANTOUL, JR., who was denied a seat in the Baltimore Convention, and who asked in vain to be heard there in explanation of his course and position, unbosomed himself, a few days afterward, in the U. S. House of Representatives. That portion of his speech relating to the act of the Convention in his case, and the Fugitive Slave Law, we copy below. It is a small cloud in the Democratic horizon, not so big as a man's hand, but it is worth looking at if only to see if it will grow larger.

EXPULSION FROM THE BALTIMORE CONVENTION.

I allude to the circumstances which recently occurred at Baltimore, as my reason for addressing the committee at this time. Sir, I was unanimously elected a delegate to the National Democratic Convention by ballot, and on the first ballot, in the fullest convention that has been held in my district for many years, a convention regularly called, according to the uniform usage in Massachusetts for the last twenty-five or thirty years. I was sent there to represent five thousand Democrats, who act with the party in its regular organization. The Convention thought proper to disfranchise my district—the only Democratic district in Massachusetts—and thought proper thereby to insult, not merely that district, but the sovereign State of Massachusetts, which was shorn of her proportionate share of representation in the Convention by that proceeding.

They then thought proper to go on and take measures for the union of the Democratic party. Is any one Democrat in Massachusetts bound by what you do in such a convention? I speak not of the course which those Democrats may think proper to take. That is a matter for them to determine. But I ask if any one Democrat in the State of Massachusetts is under any obligation, growing out of the proceedings of a convention in which the State of Massachusetts was deprived of her proportionate number of delegates elected by her choice? That is a question for the Democratic party to consider, and for the Democrats of Massachusetts to consider.

As to the district which has been thus disfranchised, why, sir, if there is a district in the United States, from the Madawaska to the Rio Grande—if there is a district from Massachusetts bay to San Francisco that is, and ought to be, Democratic, it is the district that I represent; and I should like to compare its history with the history of any other district represented by any other individual upon this floor.

Sir, in my district is that glorious old town of Marblehead. Elbridge Gerry, coming from the town of Marblehead, was the chairman of the committee that reported the resolutions of the 30th of April, 1783, giving the power to regulate commerce to the government of the nation—the resolutions that laid the foundation of your federal union. It was a citizen of my own native town of Beverly, and a native of my own district, Nathan Dane, who was chairman of the committee that reported the resolves of the 21st of February, 1787, for calling the Federal Convention at Philadelphia—the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States; and that same Nathan Dane, of that same town of Beverly

naval heroes, the first man who poured out his life's blood in that great war against Slavery, crying, as Lawrence afterwards cried, "Don't give up the ship," was Captain Mugford, of Marblehead, on the 19th of May, 1775.

There is the material out of which to form a Democratic Congressional district. It is a district that has bright revolutionary glory—historical glory thickly clustered around it. It is not to me that the insult has been offered, but it is to that district which I have described to you.

Why, I ask, is it that this insult has been offered? It is simply because, as I told the committee who examined that case, when they asked me if I would pledge myself beforehand to agree to the resolutions which might be adopted by that convention, "I do my own thinking, and do not allow any convention to do it for me." That is the reason. Well, now, do gentlemen suppose there are not some millions of white persons at the North who do their own thinking, as well as myself? If they suppose any such thing, they are grievously mistaken, and by and by the consequence of that mistake will begin to appear, a little more clearly than they now appear. It is because I determined to think for myself, and adhered to that determination, upon a great question of constitutional law; and thought it a duty incumbent upon me to avow the conclusions at which I had arrived.

FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW IN CONFLICT WITH STATE RIGHTS AND IN VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTION.

The question of constitutional law I now propose to examine. It is this: Is there in the Constitution of the United States a grant of power to legislate for the rendition of fugitives from labour? I say there is not; and no man who calls himself a Democrat—whether he hails from New Hampshire or any other part of the Union—can for a moment sustain his character as a Democrat upon the position that there is such a grant of power. Why, sir, what is the distinguishing doctrine of the Democratic party? I suppose it is the doctrine laid down by Jefferson, in his comments upon the proposed veto of the first United States Bank. Thomas Jefferson says: "I conceive the corner-stone of the Constitution to be laid in the tenth article of the amendments to the Constitution:" the article that no powers can be exercised by the General Government except such as are granted to it; that powers not granted to the General Government "are reserved to the States or to the people." That is the foundation of the Democratic faith, so stated to be by Thomas Jefferson, so understood to be by Samuel Adams and Elbridge Gerry, and all the old Democrats of New England, as well as by Virginia, and the Democrats in the South; and that is the doctrine upon which I mean to take my stand. That is the doctrine of the Baltimore resolutions *as they were*; the doctrine of the resolutions of 1798, '99, adopted at Baltimore the other day, which gentlemen talk about in such a way as to lead one to suspect that they have not read them—the doctrine of the resolutions of 1798, '99, which declared the alien and sedition laws to be unconstitutional, by a course of reasoning which applies as strictly to this question of the fugitive slave law as it does to the alien law, or the sedition law, or to any section or clause of either.

But the State of New Hampshire, when the constitutionality of the alien and sedition laws came up in her Legislature, voted unanimously, in a full House, one hundred and thirty-seven members being present, and unanimously in the Senate, that those laws were clearly "constitutional, and, in the present critical situation of our country," said they, "highly expedient." Is there a man in New Hampshire who believes that now? New Hampshire blushes when that page of history is recalled to the memory. It was then the unanimous opinion of the Senate and House of Representatives of New Hampshire, that the alien and sedition laws were "constitutional." It is the unanimous opinion of New Hampshire now, that they are unconstitutional; and, sir, the day will come when every man's children will blush for his servile heresy upon this question, as the men of New Hampshire now blush for what their fathers did upon that question.

The question of the constitutionality of such a grant of power is within a very narrow compass. It is only necessary to take up the history of the clauses included in the fourth article of the Constitution, and see where they came from, what they mean, and what changes they underwent. Sir, everybody knows that the Constitution contains an enumeration of powers granted to Congress. The powers granted to Congress stand by themselves, as they did in the old Articles of Confederation. In another part of that instrument, distinct from the enumeration of powers granted to Congress, you find certain clauses of compact. I suppose there is not a man in this house who will undertake to deny that these are clauses of mere compact in the Constitution—clauses of compact between the States, which imply no grant of power whatever to the Federal Government. The whole question is, does the clause relating to the fugitives from labour belong to that class of clauses which give powers to the General Government, or is it simply a clause of compact between the States? This is the question.

Well, now, sir, the Continental Congress resolved, on the 11th June, 1776, to appoint a committee of one from each colony to report articles of confederation. The next day the committee was appointed, and Samuel Adams, of Massachusetts, was the member from that State upon it. On the 12th July, 1776, a little more than a month afterwards, this committee reported the articles, which were debated, from time to time, and adopted by Congress on the 15th of November, 1777. They were ratified by the States, one after another, until Maryland, the last on the list, acted upon them on the 1st of March, 1781.

The first article established the style of confederacy—it shall be "The United States of America." The second article is the key to the whole: and is therefore very important to be considered. It determines that the government to be established for the management of the general interests of the United States shall be strictly held, and confined within the limits of powers expressly granted by the act of confederation. It is in these words: "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right which is not, in this confederation, expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled."

No implied powers there! "Expressly delegated." This, I say, is the corner-stone of the whole system of the confederation—State rights jealously preserved; a few powers clearly defined are granted to Congress, which is sternly prohibited at the outset, by the first fundamental principles of its existence, from assuming any scintilla of power not so granted.

There can be no difficulty, then, in ascertaining what powers belonged to the Congress under the confederation. We have only to read the enumeration, and we shall find them all expressly delegated; none others existed.

Let us proceed, then, with our examination of the several "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union."

By the third article, the said States "severally enter into a firm league of friendship;" but no power is granted to Congress.

By the fourth article, the free inhabitants of each State, except paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice, are "entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States;" but no grant of power is connected with this particular provision of the compact.

A second clause of the same article is in these words: "If any person guilty of, or charged with, treason, felony, or other high misdemeanour, in any State, shall flee from justice, and be found in any of the United States, he shall, upon demand of the Governor or executive officer of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, and removed to the State having jurisdiction of the offence." The power to deliver up the person guilty, or charged, is not "expressly delegated to the United States," but "each State retains" that power as entire, and unimpaired, and unquestionable, as if the consideration had never been brought into existence.

A third clause of the same article in these words: "Full faith and credit shall be given in each of these States to the records, acts, and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrates of every other State." The Congress had no power to enforce or to regulate this stipulation of the compact. Each State retained unimpaired, and unquestioned, all and "every power, jurisdiction, and right," over the manner in which this agreement should be performed, and the effect of that performance.

Now, the substance of this fourth article of confederation—the substance of each of the three clauses of this fourth article—has found its way into the constitution of the United States, constituting, together with certain additional provisions to be considered by and by, and the first and second sections of the fourth article of that instrument.

How came these agreements of the old compact of 1777 into the federal constitution of the 17 of September, 1787? What changes have they undergone in passing them? What effect and force, in their present form, do they now carry with them? Are they, by any means, transformed from mutual stipulations by contracting parties, into grants of power, by surrendering what they had retained and reserved to themselves for ten years, to a new administration of the powers, jurisdiction, and rights, in this behalf, then for the first time delegated to the United States?

If so, how, when, why, by whom, by what apt words to express the transformation of these mutual covenants into delegations of power, was this new grant first made, and where in the record, do you find it written down?

We will trace the subsequent history of these stipulations of the old confederacy, and examine, first, the process to which they have been subjected, the changes resulting from it, and the addition they have received, and when we have received, and when we have sufficiently considered the clauses by themselves, we will inquire whether they are affected by their relation to other parts of the same instrument, and whether any different rule of construction is to be applied to interpret them, so as entirely to change their character.

It does not appear that any complaint was made of the non-performance of either of these three stipulations by any State, either in the continental Congress during the ten years that followed the adoption of the Articles of Confederation, or in the constitutional convention during its whole session, or that any apprehension of such non-performance in future was expressed from any quarter. Nor does it appear that any objection was raised against the clause concerning the faith due to records, or that concerning fugitives from justice.

It was, however, as it would appear, repugnant to the sentiments of South Carolina to guarantee all the privileges of free citizens of her own State to the coloured free inhabitants of other States. On the 25th of June, 1778, South Carolina accordingly moved to insert the word "*white*" in article fourth, clause first, between the words "free inhabitants."

On this proposition the States voted—ayes 2, nays 8, divided 1; and the motion was rejected; the two ayes were South Carolina and Georgia.

South Carolina moved, after the words "several States," to insert "according to the law of such States respectively, for the government of their own free *white* inhabitants." On which motion the ayes were 2, the nays 8, divided 1; and it was rejected.

South Carolina was unable to repeal that clause of the old confederation, or prevent its passing into the new constitution. But she has found a very convenient way of escaping its consequences since that time, and calls upon other States to fulfil their agreements in these articles of compact, a portion of which, understanding it perfectly well, as she showed by trying to change it, she still goes on coolly and deliberately, and habitually, and perseveringly to violate.

No other change seems to have been suggested in either of these clauses in the Continental Congress during the whole period of ten years.

On the 21st February, 1787, a grand committee, of which the Hon. Nathan Dane, of Beverly, Massachusetts, was chairman, recommended a meeting of delegates from each State to revise the Articles of Confederation. On the motion of the delegates from Massachusetts, it was resolved to call a convention for that purpose, to meet at Philadelphia on the second Monday in May.

Sundry members met on that day, May 14th, 1787, but the convention did not elect their President, George Washington, until the 25th. On Monday, the 28th, they adopted their rules and orders, and on the 28th they proceeded to business. On that day, Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, submitted a draft of a constitution, which became the basis of the further action of the convention.

In this draft the twelfth and thirteenth articles were as follows:

"ART. XII. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States. Any person charged with crimes in any State fleeing from justice to another, shall, on demand of the executive of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, and removed to the State having jurisdiction of the offence.

"ART. XIII. Full faith shall be given, in each State, to the acts of the Legislature, and to the records and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrate of every State."

There is no reason to suspect, therefore, that it had occurred to South Carolina at that time to convert either of these clauses into a grant of power, or to insert among them any provision for the case of fugitives from service. Neither of these changes had been thought of either by South Carolina, or, so far as we know, by any other State. That these clauses, as they stood in the Articles of Confederation, were so far satisfactory to all sections and to all parties as not to be among those provisions of the compact which it was desired to revise, and which the convention had come together expressly to reform, seems to be quite evident, not only from the facts already stated, but also from the circumstance that in the *six other* plans submitted to the constitution convention, in the form of resolutions, embodying the views of leading statesmen, and of the parties struggling to mould the new institutions upon principles in some respects widely diverse from each other, neither the faith due to public records, nor the immunities mutually pledged to citizens, nor the extradition of fugitives from labour, is so much as once alluded to. Yet the very object of all these resolutions was to bring forward and present for discussion the views of their authors upon all disputed points involved in the mission of the convention.

The plans to which I refer were Edmund Randolph's fifteen propositions, presented May 29th; Mr. Paterson's eleven propositions, presented June 15th; Colonel Hamilton's plan in eleven propositions, presented June 18th; Randolph's plan as amended, and again submitted in Committee of the Whole, in nineteen resulutions, June 19; the report of the Committee of Detail on the twenty-three resolutions, July 26th; the report of eleven, made September 4th, and for several days afterwards. Neither of these plans contains any allusion to the question of fugitives from service, now insanely imagined by the fanatics of slave-worship to have been one of the leading "compromises of the Constitution"—a thing which no man in the convention which framed the Constitution dreamt of until it was suggested in another assembly, and upon another occasion, and for another purpose. On the 18th of June, the same day in which he submitted his plan, Mr. Hamilton read, as a part of his great speech, his complete draft of a constitution, in which the clauses already given from Pinckney's draft reappears in the following shape:

"ART. IX—Sec. 5. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to the rights, privileges and immunities of citizens in every other State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of another.

"SEC. 6. Fugitives from justice from one State, who shall be found in another, shall be delivered up on the application of the State from which they fled."

The draft of Mr. Hamilton is a carefully finished production, carried out in all the minute details, and giving the author's matured opinions of what the Constitution ought to be in every one of its provisions. This gentleman represented the ultra federal, consolidation, monarchical tendencies of the convention more fully and frankly than any other member; and was most desirous to multiply and extend grants of power to the federal government. He carried this notion so far as to desire that the legislation of each State should be controlled by the United States; and to effect this object, in the tenth of the resolutions offered by him on the 18th of June, he proposed that the Governor of each State should be appointed by the general government, and have a veto upon all laws about to be passed in the State of which he was Governor. This, with his President and Senate for life, as proposed in the same resolutions, would have constituted a consolidated monarchy.

Mr Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, was the champion of the sectional slave interest, and he also declared, in the debate on the 23d of August, that he thought the State Executive should be appointed by the general government, and have a control over the State laws by means of a veto. Neither Mr. Hamilton, nor any other friend of the northern monarchical interest, nor Mr. Pinckney, nor any other Southern friend of the sectional slave interest, had suggested in their drafts, of resolutions, or speeches, or in any other way; still less had any friend of democratic freedom and state rights suggested, before the 28th of August, to give Congress any power over either of the three subjects of compact, viz.: credit due to records, immunities of citizens and fugitives from justice; nor had any one alluded in the convention to the subject of fugitives from service. On the 6th of August, about a month after the principal compromises had been settled, and the difficulties surmounted, a committee of five—of which John Rutledge, of South Carolina, was chairman—reported a constitution entire, a printed copy being handed on the same day to each member. In their report, the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth articles are as follows:

"ART. XIV. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

"ART. XV. Any person charged with treason, felony, or high misdemeanour in any State, who shall flee from justice, and shall be found in any other State, shall, on demand of the Executive power of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, and removed to the State having jurisdiction of the offence.

"ART. XVI. Full faith shall be given in each State to the acts of the Legislature, and to the records and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrates of every other State."

On the 13th of August, these paragraphs came up in order for consideration. Article fourteen was taken up. General Pinckney, (Charles Cotesworth Pinckney) was satisfied with it. He seemed to wish some provision should be included in favour of property in slaves. Article fourteen was adopted—ayes 9, nay (South Carolina) 1, divided (Georgia) 1. Article fifteen, the words "high misdemeanour" were struck out, and "other crime" inserted. Mr. Butler and Mr. Pinckney (Mr. C. Pinckney), both of South Carolina, moved to require "fugitive slaves and servants to be delivered up like criminals." Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, said, "this would oblige the executive of the State to do it at the public expense. Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, saw no more propriety in the public seizing and surrendering a slave, or servant, than a horse. Mr. Butler does not object to either objection; but he undertakes to change his proposition. "He withdrew his proposition, in order that some particular proposition might be made apart from this article." Article fifteen was then adopted unanimously.

Thus far there is no indication of any intent to make a grant of power. Butler's motion to require slaves to be delivered up, was to "require" the State to do it—not to empower Congress to do it; or rather to authorize the National Executive to do it. Wilson's objection shows this understanding. It would oblige the Executive of the State to do it at the public expense, as happens when one State demands from another a fugitive from justice. Sherman thought the public had no more cause to seize a slave than a horse. How did Butler propose to obviate this objection? Was it by transferring the duty and expense from the lesser public, the State, to that greater public, the United States? *It was by giving to the master the same authority to recover his servant that he had already to recover his horse; and it goes no further. A Virginian horse would be property in Pennsylvania. A Virginian negro held to service, might not be property in Pennsylvania. The Constitution stipulates that the character of property attaching to him before his escape, shall continue to attach to him in any State to which he may flee, whatever may be the laws of that State. A horse so escaping must be delivered up; so also must be a fugitive from labour. And that is all.*

When gentlemen imagine that the Constitution has attributed to the negro held to service—to that description of property—the character of sacredness that does not attach to any other property whatever, they misread the constitution, and misjudge the men who framed it. Than have done what you impute to them, some of them would sooner have had their right hands cut off; yet the clause as it now stands passed unanimously. The strict attention of very sharp intellects was drawn to this very question which I have been discussing in that convention, and they settled it with their eyes wide open, and as I have, as I will, prove to this committee. Article sixteenth of the draft was that concerning public faith in the acts of the Legislatures and records, and judicial proceedings of the courts and magistrates of the several States. That was the last in this series of compacts. What did the convention do with it?

August 29. Mr. Williamson (of North Carolina) moved to substitute in place of article 16th, "the words of the Articles of Confederation on the same subject. He did not understand precisely the meaning of the article." Mr. Wilson and Dr. Johnson said it meant "that judgment in one State should be the ground of actions in other States; and that acts of the legislature should be included, for the sake of acts of insolvency.

Mr. Pinckney moved to commit it, with a motion for a power to pass bankrupt laws and to regulate damages on protested bills of exchange. Mr. Madison favoured the commitment, and wished a power to be given to Congress "to provide for the execution of judgments in other States." He thought this might be safely done. Mr. Randolph thought there was no instance under heaven of one nation executing the judgments of another. He had not been graduated in the modern Virginia consolidation school. Governeur Morris moved to commit also a motion to give to Congress power "to determine the proof and effect of such acts, records and proceedings." Nobody dreamed that there was a power in the article already.

Many thought one should be inserted. It was committed. It became the opinion of the majority that they had better attach to the compact a clause giving power to Congress over that subject, the faith to be given to records.

Judge Rutledge, of South Carolina, was the chairman of the committee to which these claims were referred to make the change. They took the clause which stood last in order and transferred it to the head of the list where it now stands, attaching to it power to Congress to act upon the subject. There it stands. Were these men so simple as not to know whether a grant of power was necessary to be added, in express words, to enable Congress to determine the effect of public acts, records, &c., in another State? Congress had the power already as the article stood, if they have any power under either of the other clauses over fugitives from labour, or either of the subjects of either of these clauses of compact.

But so thought not John Rutledge, of South Carolina, who reported the grant of power; James Madison, of Virginia, who desired a grant of power, and favoured a commitment for that purpose; Gouverneur Morris, a high-toned federalist, who could find constructive powers whenever Hamilton could find them, but could find none here, and therefore asked for an express grant. All these clauses were in the confederation originally, and articles of compact there, and nobody had ever pretended that they were anything else there. All the four clauses are still in their language, in terms, in their obvious—one might almost say, in their only possible construction, articles of compact. Still, it is agreed to attach to one of them a grant of power, and not to the other three. The convention takes out that fourth clause, makes it the first, and says that Congress shall have power to determine the effect to be given to the public records of the States. Where did Congress get that power from, in either of the above clauses of compact, where it is not given? Why did Congress have the power given to them by express words in that clause, if the government had it already in all these clauses, as they must, if they had it in either? These were not the men to waste words. There is not a document in the language of any human race which treads the face of the globe, so carefully considered in the effect of every word, as the Constitution of the United States. When the Constitutional Convention saw they had not made a grant of power, in either of these four clauses, they came to the conclusion that they had better make it as to one of them. They knew what to do. They picked out that clause, put it at the head of the article, and said Congress shall have power to determine, by law, what shall be the effect given to public records. Why did they not say: "Congress shall have power to provide for the rendition of fugitives from labour?"

That is what they would have said had they so meant. They did not so mean, and therefore they did not say it. And this is the only reason which the ingenuity of man can divine for the omission to express a grant of power in this clause of a constitution, which grants no powers except those given in so many words, or those which, being subsidiary in their nature, are essential to the carrying into exercise of powers granted in so many words. Where they desired a power, the clause was changed. Who made that change! John Rutledge was chairman of the committee appointed on the 29th of August, that reported that clause as altered, giving the power to Congress. Mr. Pierce Butler, General Pinckney, and Mr. C. Pinckney, the three other members from South Carolina—for they were four in all—each of them, had his attention called to this subject on the very day before that on which the committee was appointed, they had, each of them, alluded to it in the Convention, and nobody else had done so, in the debate of August 28th. Three members from South Carolina—each having his attention specially called to the subject of fugitives from labour, on the 28th of August—that subject brought up again on the 29th John Rutledge was chairman of the committee of five, appointed on the 29th, when Mr. Batten moved the clause of fugitives from labour, and that committee of five, who reported this clause on the first of September, took the ground that the power to legislate on the proof and effect of public acts, must be expressly granted. On the 3d of September another debate took place, on granting this power, in which Madison, Gouverneur Morris, Colonel Morris, Colonel Mason, Mr. Wilson, Dr. Johnson, and Mr. Randolph participated, with various views. No one suggests that the clause will give a power, although none be expressed. The doctrine of implied powers had not then been strained so far. No one suggests a power over fugitives from labour. Slavocracy had not then ventured so far. It would have been rejected at once. But the clause as it stands passed unanimously.

Does it not make a clear case? I would like to see those profound lawyers of New Hampshire, or Virginia, or anywhere else, show us how the power was put into this clause of fugitive from labour, which was not originally there; and who put it there; and where, and how. Roger Sherman and Elbridge Gerry were induced to put it there. John Rutledge put it there, in the clause of faith and credit to records; but he did not put it into the other clause. He had a reason for putting it in the one clause, and he had a reason for omitting it in the other clause. When Col. Mason, on the 22d of August, only a week before this clause was unanimously adopted, told the world that "every master of slaves is born a petty tyrant; they bring the judgment of heaven on a country; its actions cannot be rewarded or punished in the next world; they must be in this, by an inevitable chain of causes and effects. Providence punishes national sins and national calamities." * * "he held it essential, in every point of view, that the general government should have power to prevent the increase of Slavery;" when that far seeing Virginian, who seems to have anticipated the history of Virginia in the nineteenth century, uttered these memorable words in the Convention, do you suppose that he was contriving a government to be used as a great negro-catching machine, and that should be good for nothing else—to be broken up the moment it ceased to perform that function, as seems now to be the prevailing opinion among the demagogues of both parties? Do you suppose for a moment that James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, George Washington, George Mason, and other Abolitionists of that day—to use the word as we hear it used every day in Congress—imagined that a provision so abhorrent to their general views had been inserted in the constitution, and did not make it the subject of indignant comment in the Convention or out of the Convention? Mr. Madison would not suffer the black and odious name of slave to be named in the Constitution. Is it conceivable that he meant to enroll the hunting-down of the fugitive slave among the highest duties of the government founded under that Constitution, as our present administration esteems it to be?

Are we to believe that one-half of the Convention, being honest and firm men, belied all the instincts of their hearts, all the prejudices, if you choose so to phrase it, of their education, all that devotion to the principles of liberty in the abstract, which the Revolution had developed, and made themselves parties, without a particle of inducement held out to them, without a word of remonstrance from one of them, to an eternal national slave hunt? Are we to believe this, not only without evidence, but against all the evidences? Let me remark upon the strangeness of this fact. Among the thousand letters written by leading members of the Constitution Convention, or of the State Convention at the South, and at the North, never was there anything produced that would lead one to suppose for a moment that the Convention, or any man in it, or any man out of it, in the year 1787, suspected that the clause relative to fugitives from labour, contained a grant of power.

Not a solitary letter, speech, journal, memorandum or record, of any description, has been brought forward, which contains the explanation which is now put upon this clause for the purpose of impairing State rights—helping to build up a consolidated system of government, which is centralizing power, and growing stronger and stronger every day and every hour, without casting into the vortex to be swallowed up in the federal maelstrom, the State institution of Slavery!

Do the Southern gentlemen know what they are doing? Do you mean to throw the whole power over the subject of Slavery into the hands of the Federal Government? You do it here.

Do gentlemen desire that two-thirds of the white men of the country—aye, a great many more than two-thirds very soon, for by the next census we shall have at least twenty-one millions of white people at the north, and nine millions, at the utmost, at the South—do gentlemen desire that those twenty-one millions of people should take this subject of Slavery into their hands—to let it agitate, and agitate, and convulse the whole nation, until it shall finally be treated, as it will be treated if it becomes the fuel of a universal conflagration through this land. Let southern statesmen take warning in this matter. I desire to stand upon the Constitution, your only rock of safety, in this terrible future, glimpses of which are opening upon us—to stand there, because I think I can stand there safely, and nowhere else.

When I said that John Rutledge, of South Carolina, was the man who reported the grant of power in the one clause, but that he did not report any such grant in the other clause, I had not exhausted the argument. The clauses underwent another scrutiny; they passed another ordeal. This matter was committed to a committee of eleven for revision. It came back in essentially the same shape. Who was upon the committee of revision? Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, of South Carolina, was one of that committee of eleven. His attention had been drawn to this subject, the reclamation of fugitive slaves, for he had not only taken part in the discussion of the subject on the 28th, but he was the individual member who first introduced it to the notice of the Convention. If he wanted a grant of power, he knew how it was to be expressed, for the clause in which the grant of power was inserted on the same day that the fugitive from labour clause was adopted, was also before that committee. James Madison, a sound and a keen constitutional lawyer, was one of that committee. Luther Martin, of Maryland, was also of that committee. If ever there was a strict constructionist, Luther Martin was one; and he also, as well as Mr. Madison, was a sound constitutional lawyer, as the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Bayly) who revived this matter the other day, will allow. If the committee intended a grant of power, would Luther Martin have left it to be implied, and that, too, in such a manner that it requires to be sharpened by a judicial decision to discover the implication?

Williamson, of North Carolina, was also of that committee. Here were men who would look to the interests of the South, and if they meant a grant of power, express a grant of power. Why did they not do it? Why did they not put it there? They have not put it there. Perhaps they did not want it; perhaps they wanted the power, but knew they could not have it. One or the other is the natural and true interpretation. This clause came from the ordinance of 1787, passed by the Congress of the Confederation—a clause that there should be no Slavery northwest of the Ohio, and that a fugitive flying from labour into that territory should be delivered up.

That was a compact, and that compact we could not fail to understand. It contained no grant of power. It is not materially changed as to this point. Trace out its history; it is easy to find what that compact was, and whence it came. It was copied from an old English compact, made in the year 1642, between Massachusetts bay and her neighbour colonies. Afterwards, substantially, the same compact was renewed and extended a little further, but granting no power—simply an agreement to return each other's runaway servants. This is the whole history of it. Nathan Dane copied a familiar provision of New England policy from those old contracts into the ordinance, which made the whole northwest free soil forever.

Mr. Jefferson, in 1784, attempted to make all the territory then belonging to the United States free soil. He attempted to exclude Slavery by an organic ordinance from Alabama and Mississippi, and all the southwest as well as the northwest. It was defeated by the vote of Mr. Speight, of the State of North Carolina. If Speight had been a Jeffersonian Democrat that day, there would have been no Slavery west of the Alleghanies. Mr. Jefferson proposed to exclude Slavery, but did not provide for the rendition of fugitive slaves. That was Thomas Jefferson's plan in 1784.

[Here the hammer fell.]

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COLOURED HOME.—The Twelfth Anniversary of the Coloured Home of the City of New York, was held at that institution yesterday afternoon, commencing at 2 o'clock, P. M. The oppressive heat and dust prevented many of its friends from attending the exercises—which were of an interesting character. Rev. Mr. Darling, Chaplain, presided, and read the annual report. The principal address for the occasion was delivered by Rev. Mr. McAuley, of the Reformed Dutch Church, in Fifth avenue.

This institution is located on Sixty fifth st, near First av. The territory occupied by the building, grounds, &c., consists of forty-four city lots. There are two large four-story buildings facing each other about two hundred feet apart with ends towards the street. A two-story building at the ends most distant from the street unites the buildings, which thus enclose an area that is appropriated to a park, and enclosed with a neat white fence. These buildings accommodated over four hundred persons at once last winter. There are at present about 200 coloured persons residing there—many of them aged and decrepid and others sick.

The objects of the institution are to provide a home for the aged and infirm coloured people; to afford a temporary residence to persons out of employment and destitute, until they can again be employed; and to rescue others from evil ways and work a reformation in their character. Their report, speaking of the origin of the institution says, that "thirteen years ago a band of three or four benevolent women met at the fireside of one of their number, to devise methods of benefitting that class of the community, who, having spent their years at our service, are, at an advanced age, thrown upon the public charity or private bounty for a precarious support."

One great object of the managers and supporters of this institution is the moral and intellectual improvement of the class, whose position is more hopeless than that of any other class. The emigrant that lands here—even though he may have been schooled in the prisons and alms houses of the Old World, feels that *here*, in this country, there is hope for his *children*, if not for him; and this hope sustains him in privations, otherwise undurable. But for the coloured man in this country, or for *his* children, no future dawns with promise—his doom and that of his children in this land, is inferiority. Those who have undertaken this benevolent work bestow personal effort as well as money upon it. During the year one lady has made thirty-eight visits, another twenty-nine, and so on. A number of the managers may frequently be found instructing the ignorant, and striving by their councils and prayers to restore the depraved to the paths of peace and purity. A library, now amounting to 355 volumes, beside pamphlets and tracts, has been provided for the use of the inmates of the Home. In 1845, places were found for four, of whom two proved faithful; the next year seven out of nine proved faithful to those who employed them, and last year places were found for forty-seven, and but one of them has been returned. The average annual admissions for the last eight years have been 500. Many instances have occurred of the complete reformation, and religious conversion of the depraved. The efforts of Rev. C. C. Darling and Rev. Mr. Peters are spoken of as assiduous and to a great degree successful.

The Report of the Treasurer from May 1, 1851, to April 30, 1852, shows the collection and disbursement of about $9,000, leaving $123 11 in the treasury. Of the above receipts, $7,691 41 came from the city authorities. The remainder is principally raised by subscriptions and donations. During the year, 1,800 articles of clothing have been made by the inmates of the Home; 260 pairs of stockings have been knit, and 60 yards of rag carpeting made. There have been 3,106 garments given out to the inmates for the year ending May 1852.

The officers of this Society are: Mrs. Mary Ann Wells, First Directress; Mrs. Samuel J. Bebee, Second Directress; Mrs. W. W. Chester, Recording Secretary; Mrs. N. E. Russell, Corresponding Secretary; and Mrs. John Harper, Treasurer. The Board of Managers is composed of twenty-one ladies of high standing. A Board of Advisers, consisting of eight gentlemen and the ladies. The Steward is Mr. James Beatty; the Matron, Mrs. Ann M. Beatty; and the teacher Miss Sarah Beatty.—*Tribune.*

EMANCIPATION OF SEVENTEEN SLAVES.—Within the last ten days there have arrived in this city from Newbern, N. C., seventeen emancipated slaves. They were enfranchised by the last will and testament of Susan Jones, deceased, who stated her motive in these words: "I am anxious to reward the meritorious services of the following named slaves with the boon of freedom." She directed her executors to apply a sum not exceeding $500 to pay their passage and settle the said slaves in some one of the Free States. Her heirs attempted to break this clause of the will, but a bill in chancery being filed in the Supreme Court of North Carolina, its validity was affirmed. Mr. Council Wooten, one of the executors, brought the emancipated slaves to this city in fulfilment of the testator's will. Eight of them are adults, whose ages range from eighteen up to forty-eight. Of the others, one is sixteen and another twelve, while the remaining five are still younger. By the active efforts of Passmore Williamson, an officer of the Old Abolition Society, all save a part of the children and one man who for special reasons is going back (free) to his family in Newbern, have been provided with suitable places, where we trust they will do well.

The pleasure we feel in recording this announcement of the freedom of this little company of slaves, affords us some slight conception of the fuller joy with which we hope to welcome the proclamation of "Liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." That day of Jubilee will come sooner or later, and either on earth or in heaven we expect to witness it.—*Pennsylvania Freeman.*


# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE, 24 1852.


## Freedom's Grand and True Celebration of Independence Day.

THE Board of Managers of the Massachusetts A. S. Society announce to the unwearied friends of the millions yet groaning in bondage on the American Soil, that the FOURTH OF JULY will be consecrated by the Society, as hitherto, by a MASS CELEBRATION in the beautiful Grove at Abington, at which their presence, from the various sections of the State, is strongly solicited—the day and the occasion being most appropriately theirs, to be used efficiently for the advent of that glorious day when 'liberty shall be proclaimed throughout ALL the land, unto ALL the inhabitants thereof.'

☞ As the 4th of July, this year, occurs on Sunday, the celebration will take place on MONDAY, the 5th.

☞ A special train of cars will leave the Old Colony Railroad Depot, Boston, at half-past 9 o'clock, A. M., precisely. This will allow ample time for our friends in Essex, Middlesex and Worcester counties to reach the city by the earliest trains, in season for the excursion. Returning, the train from Abington will leave so as to arrive in Boston as early as 7, P. M.

☞ Among the speakers expected to be present on the occasion, are Wendell Phillips, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Edmund Quincy, Parker Pillsbury, Stephen S. Foster, Abby K. Foster, Miss Sallie Hollie (of Rochester, N. Y.), Charles L. Remond, and Nathaniel H. Whiting.

☞ Should the weather prove unpropitious for assembling in the Grove, the meetings will be held in the Town Hall, immediately adjacent to the Grove.

☞ The fare, by special train, will be *half price*; but, to ensure this, one hundred passengers are necessary. As many as intend going from Boston and the vicinity, are requested to leave their names at the Anti-Slavery Office, 21 Cornhill, seasonably. The half fare arrangement will extend to passengers from both ends of the road, and to those coming by the South Shore railroad. FRANCIS JACKSON, Pres.

EDMUND QUINCY, Sec.

## THE DEFEAT OF DANIEL WEBSTER

A DELICIOUS day, this twenty-first day of June! It well deserves to be the longest day of the year, if it be not—quite. It should ever be noted with a white mark in every honest man's calendar.

One crowded hour of such a day—say the hour from half-past one to half past two—were well worth an age of vulgar days. O that you could have seen the faces in State Street to-day, when the fatal news was flashed over the wires, that Scott had got the nomination! Hogarth himself would have broken down in the attempt to portray them. What looks of rage and mortification were cast at the blue flag under the Star-Spangled Banner on the top of the Old State House, that signalized the political death of the man State Street had bought and has paid for so many times over! O, it was an exquisite pleasure to look upon them! Too good for every day. It is well that there is not a chance for such ecstacy oftener than once in four years—if, indeed, more than once in a life time. It might be fatal if two often repeated.

"'Tis bliss but to a certain bound;
Beyond 'tis agony!"

It was a pleasure akin to that we used to be taught, at Andover, awaited the Blest In Glory, of looking down over the battlements of Heaven and chuckling over the torments of the damned in the bottomless pit. For, though we do not profess to be eminent Saints, yet sure are we that if the torments of the damned were not endured in Boston to-day, there is no hell on Earth, at least.

There they were—the Retainers, the Signers of Webster Letters, the Getters-up of Union Meetings, the men whose apprentices formed the Sims Brigade, the "Fifteen Hundred Scoundrels," as Wendell Phillips fitly styled them, who volunteered their aid to Marshal Devens to help him carry poor Sims from the chained Court House to Pearson's Slave Ship—there they were, disappointed, disgraced, scorned, spit upon, their hopes a delusion and they themselves the laughing stock and derision of the whole country! O, it was a good sight! An instructive and edifying sight! To see their inflamed eyes, their flushed cheeks, and to hear their curses, both loud and deep, and their impotent threats against the candidate of their party, was too exquisite an enjoyment! It is not often that one sees poetical justice so perfectly done as in this case. These Boston men had risked their all upon a single stake, and that stake the elevation of another man, and they lost it all. Not even the miserable satisfaction of a chance of being beaten was vouchsafed to them. They had denied everything that they had bragged of in former times. They devoured their former words by scores and by hundreds, they made the lowest and most disgraceful prostrations to the Slave Power that had ever been made, and had done the dirtiest work that had ever been demanded of human hands, and all they asked of their Southern masters was the poor boon of the nomination of the man they owned, and they were refused so much as a single vote for him! A fit ending for what was begun on the Seventh of March, 1850! Daniel Webster offered himself in market-overt to the South. He has diligently done their work and humbly bowed himself before them ever since, and in return he gets not a vote beyond the Potomac! And but six out of New England!

Never was wickedness more disgracefully defeated—never were the instruments of Divine Justice more fitly chosen. Those who have read the columns of this paper for the last three years can bear witness that what is now History has been prophesied here even since that gigantic Treason was committed. We always told the world that the Slaveholders would never trust Daniel Webster. They might use him (and they *have*, gladly), but they would never let him use them. The snare he laid for them was set too openly in the eyes of such crafty fowl as they. The dough-face Fillmore was material better adapted to the manipulation of their plastic hands, than the cast-iron villany of Webster. A bitter aggravation of his mortification to have one whom he must so cordially despise preferred to him by those for whose favour he had sacrificed everything. In Ambition as in Love it is no mean embitterment to see a meaner rival carry away the prize.

"But whom he wishes most shall seldom gain
Through her perverseness; but shall see her gained
*By a far worse!*"

He might have kept his soul and his honour, and have had quite as many votes in the Convention, after all! He need not have invented the enormous Lie of the Danger to the Union. He need not have debauched the souls of his party in the City to which he owes so much (in more senses than one) and to the extent of his ability throughout the Free States. It has been of no avail that he has crushed the life out of religion and ground morality to powder, making Doctors of Divinity treat for doctrine that the Law of Congress is paramount the Law of God, and that the catching of negroes is the chief end for which man was created, and for which Christ died. All these, his labours, are brought to naught. He and his hosts (if so few may be so entitled) are whelmed in the Sea which God has brought upon them as they sought, by enchantments and by force, to stay the Holy Exodus from the Land of Bondage to the Promised Land of Canada. Shout, Shadrach! for your enemy is brought low! Sing hosannas, heroes of Christiana and of Syracuse, for the Lord hath changed

reserved to the States respectively, and to the people.

*Second.* The State governments should be held secure to their reserved rights, and the General Government sustained in its constitutional powers, and the Union should be revered and watched over as the palladium of our liberties.

*Third.* That while struggling freedom everywhere enlists the warmest sympathy of the Whig party, we still adhere to the doctrines of the Father of his Country, as announced in his Farewell Address, of keeping ourselves free from all entangling alliances with foreign countries, and of never quitting our own to stand upon foreign ground—that our mission as a Republic is not to propagate our opinions, or impose on other countries our form of government, by artifice or force, but to teach, by example, and show by our success, moderation, and justice, the blessings of self-government, and the advantages of free institutions.

*Fourth.* That, as the people make and control the Government, they should obey its constitution, laws and treaties, as they would retain their self-respect, and the respect which they claim and will enforce from foreign powers.

*Fifth.* Revenue sufficient for the expenses of an economical administration of the Government, in time of peace, ought to be derived from a duty on imports, and not from direct taxation, and in laying such duties, sound policy requires a just discrimination, whereby suitable encouragement may be afforded to American industry, equally to all classes, and to all parts of the country.

*Sixth.* The Constitution vests in Congress the power to open and repair harbours, and remove obstructions from navigable rivers, whenever such improvements are necessary for the common defence, and for the protection and facility of commerce with foreign nations, or among the States—said improvements being, in every instance, national and general in their character.

*Seventh.* The Federal and State governments are parts of one system, alike necessary for the common prosperity, peace and security, and ought to be regarded alike with a cordial, habitual and immoveable attachment. Respect for the authority of each, and acquiescence in the just constitutional measures of each, are duties required by the plainest considerations of national, State, and individual welfare.

*Eighth.* That the series of resolutions known as the Compromise, including the Fugitive Slave law, are received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States as a settlement, in principle and substance—a final settlement—of the dangerous and exciting subjects which they embrace; and so far as the Fugitive Slave Law is concerned, we will maintain the same, and insist on its strict enforcement until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation against evasion or abuses, but not impairing its efficiency; and we deprecate all future agitation of the Slavery question as dangerous to our peace, and we will discountenance all efforts at the renewal or continuance of such agitation in Congress, or out of it, whenever, wherever, or however the attempt may be made, and will maintain this system of measures as policy essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union.

This was to tell the Convention what it was to do, and here we see how they did it. This is the Platform of the National Whig Party as laid down at Baltimore, and hereafter to be the creed of all good Whigs, both North and South:

The Whigs of the United States, in Convention assembled, adhering to the great conservative principles by which they are controlled and governed, and now as ever relying upon the intelligence of the American people, with an abiding confidence in their capacity for self-government, and their devotion to the Constitution and the Union, do proclaim the following as the political sentiments and determination, for the establishment and maintenance of which their national organization as a party was effected:

*First.* The Government of the United States is of a limited character, and it is confined to the exercise of powers expressly granted by the Constitution, and such as may be necessary and proper for carrying the granted powers into full execution, and that all powers not granted or necessarily implied are expressly reserved to the States respectively and to the people.

*Second.* The State Governments should be held secure to their reserved rights, and the General Government sustained in its constitutional powers, and that the Union should be revered and watched over as the palladium of our liberties.

*Third.* That while struggling freedom everywhere enlists the warmest sympathy of the Whig party, we still adhere to the doctrines of the Father of his Country, as announced in his Farewell Address, of keeping ourselves free from all entangling alliances with foreign countries, and of never quitting our own to stand upon foreign ground; that our mission as a republic is not to propagate our opinions, or impose on other countries our form of government, by artifice or force; but to teach, by example, and show by our success, moderation and justice, the blessings of self-government, and the advantages of free institutions.

*Fourth.* That, as the people make and control the Government, they should obey its constitution, laws and treaties, as they would retain their self-respect, and the respect which they claim and will enforce from foreign powers.

*Fifth.* Government should be conducted on principles of the strictest economy; and revenue sufficient for the expenses thereof, in time ought to be derived mainly from a duty on imports, and not from direct taxes; and in laying such duties, sound policy requires a just discrimination and, when practicable, by specific duties, whereby suitable encouragement may be afforded to American industry, equally to all classes, and to all portions of the country.

*Sixth.* The Constitution vests in Congress the power to open and repair harbours, and remove obstructions from navigable rivers, whenever such improvements are necessary for the common defence, and for the protection and facility of commerce with foreign nations, or among the States—said improvements being, in every instance, national and general in their character.

*Seventh.* The Federal and State Governments are parts of one system, alike necessary for the common prosperity, peace and security, and ought to be regarded alike with a cordial, habitual and immoveable attachment. Respect for the authority of each and acquiescence in the just constitutional measures of each, are duties required by the plainest considerations of national, State and individual welfare.

*Eighth.* That the series of acts of the Thirty-Second Congress—the Act known as the Fugitive Slave Law included—are received and acquiesced in by the Whig party of the United States, as a settlement, in principle and substance, of the dangerous and exciting questions which they embrace; and so far as they are concerned, we will maintain them and insist upon their strict enforcement until time and experience shall demonstrate the necessity of further legislation, to guard against the evasion of the laws on the one hand, and the abuse of their powers on the other, not impairing their present efficiency; and we deprecate all further agitation of the questions thus settled, as dangerous to our peace, and will discountenance all efforts to continue or renew such agitation whenever, wherever, or however the attempt may be made; and we will maintain this system as essential to the nationality of the Whig party and the integrity of the Union.

Of course it was understood that Gen. Scott was to take his stand on this platform, or he could never have been nominated. There was some little difficulty in the way of making this apparent, as the General was under bonds to keep the peace by writing no letters. It was, however, very adroitly managed. He wrote to Mr. Archer to tell him that he intended to write nothing to the Convention, and this was how he did it. In the course of debate, Mr. Botts read as follows:

MY DEAR SIR: I have decided to write nothing to the Convention or to any individual member before nomination, but, should that honour fall to my lot, I shall, in my acceptance, give my views on the Compromise measures in terms at least as strong in their favour as those I read to you two days since. Please say as much to my friends Gov. Jones, Mr. Botts, Mr. Lee, etc. In haste, yours truly,

To Hon. W. S. ARCHER. WINFIELD SCOTT.

That certainly was a most successful experiment, and deserves to be immortalized in the next edition of 'The Complete Letter Writer,' in a chapter by itself, under the head of 'How not to write a Letter.' The Resolutions he refers to are some 'Compromise' Resolutions passed at a meeting in New Jersey, as strong, the South knew, as it could ask.

But the time was to come when he might write a letter, and that was after the nomination. So after that event, Mr. Jones, of Tenn., says the Report, read a letter from Scott, dated yesterday, saying:

"Having the honour to be a candidate of the Whig Convention, I will accept the nomination if tendered to me with the platform laid down by the Convention."

This also should add to the General's already high literary reputation as a writer of letters. First, he writes to say that he does not mean to write at all till after the nomination, but is careful to state what he means to say; and when the nomination is made, this letter is read from him, written beforehand, saying that he shall accept the nomination, if he can get it, with its Platform! Truly, the 'hasty plate of soup' which, among other things, has made him famous seems to be a type of the General's character. However, the letters were understood, and that is the great thing in epistolary productions.

It only remains to say that Wm. A. Graham, of N. Carolina, was nominated for the Vice Presidency, and there ended the Whig Convention.

## *THE QUAKERS AT MARLBOROUGH.*

OLIVER JOHNSON, we believe, was born with special reference to modern Friends. His mission is not of that sacred character that his appearance among them exorcises the devils and makes them clean men, but it always, at least, seems to put the devil into them. We shall not enter into so delicate a psychological subject as to whether the devil ever finds a lodgment except where the lodgings are already swept and garnished for him, or as to whether he really enters into, or comes out of, the human heart; but we fancy our first position will not be controverted, that Oliver Johnson never rises up among Quakers, that that otherwise genally quiet, and somewhat sleepy, and dead-and-alive body, is not galvanised into a life quite as unmistakeble, and quite of the same character as that which animates the worship of the patron saint of New York, St Tammany.

The existence of the Missionary would seem to prove the necessity of the mission; and if any other evidence of that necessity were wanting, it is given in the fact that one of so gentle a spirit, has been the instrument of arousing so much commotion and developing the spirit of persecution among those who consider themselves as pre-eminently the Church of gentleness and peace.

Most of our readers will remember how Oliver Johnson disturbed the peace of the Cherry Street Friends of this city, years ago, by simply, at first, attending there as a worshipper, and looker-on, and how the meeting never got rest again till it had cast out from among them three of its best and most valuable members, the venerable and noble Isaac T. Hopper, the amiable and pure-minded Charles Marriot, and James S. Gibbons, who, having not yet gone, as the other two have done, from works to reward, we designate only by name. Later still, Johnson appeared among the Friends of Ohio, with a certificate of membership in his hand, and his advent was like to rend the Society in pieces, so great was the commotion produced by his presence. Not that he sows any seeds of discord, or throws any firebrands among the droway members; on the contrary, if he says anything, it is to arouse them merely to active and healthful life, and to emulate the example of the Fathers of their Church. But so it is that instead of producing such a result, they are disposed rather to rush upon him, and mete out to him that measure which, in the olden time, those very Fathers suffered among those to whom they went to testify as they were moved by the spirit.

On the first page of this number of our paper will be found a detailed account of the latest appearance of Mr. Johnson in a Quaker Meeting, and how it fared with him and with them. The spirit with which he has been met elsewhere manifested itself in the same kind, but in a more aggravated degree, at Marlborough. It certainly makes a very singular chapter in the History of Modern Quakerism, and one well worth reading. Mr. Johnson, we know, is a very peaceable man, one averse, from temperament and principle, to undue excitement. Though a reformer, he is no fanatic, and would always appeal, in advocating any reform, to the reason, and all the better qualities of human nature, in his hearers, and never to their baser passions. But in this particular instance he intended to bear his testimony merely to those principles which distinguish Friends as a sect, and in which he is in harmony with them, and not to advocate any special reform. Why then was he so rudely treated, and this unprecedented appeal made to the power of the law by Friends to rid them of the presence of a man who, even by right of membership, was entitled to be heard, and whose most extreme doctrines should not be offensive to Friends? He himself probably gives the true reason. The whole proceeding forcibly reminds us of a passage in 'Barclay's Apology for Quakerism,' which is certainly a very striking commentary upon the conduct of these modern Friends of Marlborough. Speaking of the Quakers of the early times, says Barclay:

"Without regard to any opposition whatsoever, they went up and down as they were moved of the Lord, preaching and propagating the truth in market places, highways, streets and public temples, though daily beaten, whipped, haled, and imprisoned therefor. And when there was amongst them a church or assembly gathered, *they taught their people to keep their meetings openly and not to shut the door nor do it by stealth, that all might know it, and those who would might enter.*"

What would have become of Marlborough Meeting in those times?

But the conclusion of the whole matter is not more curious than its beginning and progress. The Marlborough Friends, that is the mobocratic portion of them, did not reckon without their host. They knew who were their friends. On Saturday evening, the Justice pronounced the following decision in the case of those who were arraigned before him for trial for wishing to listen to the preaching of the Gospel in a meeting of the Society of which they are members

GENTLEMEN: This is a painful duty imposed upon me—to entertain a suit against you for such a cause. I undertook it with great reluctance, well knowing that the excitement thereby occasioned would have the effect to bring down upon myself, and others connected with the prosecution, the libellous remarks of the Editor of the *Pennsylvania Freeman*.

I have considered the evidence and arguments pro and con, offered in the case, and am fully of opinion that the law has been violated, and the religious meeting at Marlborough has been disturbed as charged in the complaint. I have therefore determined to vindicate the Law, and the rights of the Marlborough meeting, by imposing a fine of $5 upon each of the persons charged (together with the costs).

This fine the prisoners refused to pay, whereupon the constable was ordered to take them into custody. Eusebius Barnard then, according to a West Chester paper, "addressed those assembled—stating that he could not conscientiously pay the fine because there was a principle at stake; that they did not disturb the meeting, and that they had as much right in the meeting as the other party, because the *right* had not yet been established by law, and until that was done by the laws of the land, they claimed the right of meeting there. He stated they could with the same propriety have arrested the other party, but he loathed any such proceedings among Friends, and hoped his hands would never be guilty of anything of this kind. He said that he had come expecting to go to prison; and that he was willing to suffer persecution as did the Martyrs of old.

"After Mr. Barnard had concluded, Dr. Bartholomew Fussell said that he would not pay the fine from conscientious motives; there was a principle at stake; he would rather lie in prison than pay this fine, and would go there freely; not for the amount of the sum, but because of the principle involved. His remarks were similar to those of Mr. Barnard." The Constable, himself, however, came forward and paid the fines, whether by direction of the friends of the defendants, or whether the persecutors themselves, unwilling that the extremety of reducing such persons to jail should be resorted to, and therefore provided the means of their liberation, we are not informed.

BUCHANAN ON PIERCE.—There is, as somebody said, a great deal of 'human natur' in folks, and it will have its way, sometimes, even in politicians. A genuine bit of it from any of that class is a refreshing sight from its rarity. There is not, for instance, a spark of it apparent in Cass, Douglass, Buchanan, Marcy, or Dallas, when they step forward at a Ratification Meeting to declare with what unmixed pleasure and unmitigated satisfaction they hail the nomination of General Pierce. They deceive themselves amazingly if they think they deceive anybody else, for all the world knows that it is not in human nature, and especially not in that sort of it which animates an American politician, to entertain any such sentiments when such a disaster overwhelms all their political aspirations, and makes a waste in a moment, of all the severe and unceasing, and unscrupulous labours of many months, perhaps of years. But when one of them speaks as Mr. Buchanan has in a letter to a member of Congress, an extract from which is published in the *Washington Union*, we have a glimpse of the real 'human natur' in the man, and begin to feel toward him a little less as if he were a mere abstraction. Whining, to-be-sure, is not very dignified, but it is quite as reputable as lying, and, perhaps it is not necessary to say, a good deal truer. If we laugh at the lubber who is *licked* in a battle he himself provoked, there is no malice, though there may be contempt in our laughter; nor do we feel disposed to give a hearty kick on our own account, as we do to the scamp who takes off his hat and thanks his opponent for a drubbing, whom, we know, he would stab in the back if he could do it with impunity.

In the letter we refer to, Mr. Buchanan says:

WHEATLAND (near Lancaster) June 8, 1852.

MY DEAR SIR: For the first time, I have had a fair trial. My own delegation was able, faithful, active, and energetic; but they could not coumand success. This was not their fault. I am now perfectly satisfied with the result, belonging, as I do, to the school of optimists.

I shall give to the nominees a decided support, as I intend to do as long as I shall live, to the nominees of the Democratic party. The principles of our great party are those which alone can secure the prosperity and perpetuity of the Union. For Col. King I entertain the warmest feelings of friendship. A purer, a better, or a sounder-judging man does not live. I know Gen. Pierce very well. Throughout his congressional career he uniformly maintained the character of a sound and inflexible Democrat, and an honest and honourable man. We must do our duty, and leave the consequences to Providence.

From your friend, very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

This is the tone of genuine disappointment. Mr Buchanan says almost in so many words, he is dreadful sorry; and in this declaration, he has the advantage of creating what Mr. Emerson would call "simple relations"—simple, perhaps, in more than one sense—between himself and the country. Nobody will doubt that he is quite sincere now, whereas nobody would believe any amount of asseveration he might make at a ratification meeting. He says that he is "perfectly satisfied with the result," but it is in the tone of the Mussulman who tranquilly holds his head back for the bow-string with a "God is great." Had the Convention at Baltimore literally, as they have politically, taken Mr Buchanan's head off, he could not be otherwise than "perfectly satisfied with the result," belonging, as he does, "to the school of the optimists." That kind of resignation means a great deal with a follower of the Prophet; we have not quite so much faith in it in a disciple of St Tammany.

But if Mr. Buchanan is not a good Mussulman, he is an excellent Christian. There is not, he thinks, "a purer, a better, or a sounder-judging man" living than Mr. King. Evidently he has not the least objection to that gentleman's prospects for the Vice Presidency. But though he knows Gen Pierce very well, the most he can say of him is that he has borne a good reputation; he is "honest and honourable," and a "sound and inflexible Democrat"—as what Democrat is not? But is that the stuff out of which to make a President? Mr. Buchanan means to start that question, and, "sound and inflexible" as he is himself, it is quite plain that it would not break *his* heart if the people should decide it in the negative. He shows, at last, however, his eminently Christian spirit. "We must do our duty," he sighs, "and leave the consequences to Providence," though Peirce should be President, as, no doubt, he believes. Poor Mr. Buchanan! We did not know there was so much 'human natur' in him, though it be of the very weakest sort.

PIERCE AND PETITIONS.—*The N. Y. Evening Post* endeavours to clear Gen. Pierce from the charge of having opposed the Right of Petition, by bringing up one solitary instance in which he voted not to lay upon the table a motion to receive a petition in regard to Slavery in the District. That he may have so voted in one we do not propose to doubt. But it must have been for reasons applicable only to that instance—else why is his vote so uniformly recorded in all other instances on the side of the opponents of the Right of Petition? We have already quoted three instances in the month of January, 1837, in which he voted to refuse to receive such petitions, and there are as many more for every month in the session. And in the vote upon the memorable resolution itself, which decreed as follows:

That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions or papers, relating in any way, or to any extent, to the subject of Slavery, or to the abolition of Slavery, shall, *without being printed or referred*, be laid on the table, and no FURTHER ACTION BE HAD THEREON,

his vote stands recorded in *favour of it*, and neither *The Post*, nor all Hunkerized Barnburnerdom can blot it out.

At the same time Mr. Pierce made some remarks, which show that even at that early day, he was prepared to go all lengths to put down agitation:

When petitions of this character should be received, he would be prepared to act upon them without delay, *to reject the prayer of the petitions, to lay them on the table or to give them any other direction that might be thought best calculated to silence the agitators*, and to tranquilize the public mind.

We regret to find *The Evening Post*, whose voice has been so often and so effectively raised in behalf of Liberty of Speech and the Right of Petition, now engaged in this work. That it might, for the sake of other and more important principles, support a candidate whose opinions on some subjects were different from its own, we could readily understand and believe; but we did not expect to see it endeavouring to misrepresent those opinions, and to screen him from their consequences by a subterfuge like this.—*Albany Evening Journal.*

*The Evening Post* is not so lost to all sense of shame that it does not undertake to give a reason for its support of the Locofoco nominations. What its pretence is, and how far it is successful, may be seen by the above article from the *Albany Journal*. Something may be pardoned to the weakness of a man who, when there shall seem to be two sides to a question, shall take the wrong one. But what shall be said of him who voluntarily chooses that which he knows to be wrong, and forges an excuse for it? An open villain may be hated as well as dreaded; a villain who pretends to be a saint is despised and loathed, as well as dreaded and hated. *The Post* and its party will be welcomed to the Locofocos for the help they can render: but we cannot believe that there is a man among the Democrats, with a spark of personal honour, who does not accept with contempt the aid of such creatures as Stanton, and such papers as *The Post*.

We do not believe that paper deceives any body in regard to Pierce. If any of our readers should know of any such half-saved individual, they can show them the following gems from Pierce's congressional speeches. In 1835, he said, in the House of Representatives, as reported in the *Globe*, on the subject of receiving Anti-Slavery petitions:

"It was perfectly apparent that the question must be met, now, or at some future time, *fully and explicitly*, and such an expression of this House given as would leave no possible room to doubt, as to the opinion and sentiments entertained by its members. He, Mr. P., considered the overwhelming vote of the House the other day, laying a memorial of similar tenour upon the table, *as fixing upon it* THE STAMP OF REPROBATION!"

Also:

"For one, he was prepared to STAMP WITH DISAPPROBATION, in the most *express* and *unequivocal* terms, the WHOLE movement upon this subject." [The abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.]

And:

"If the motion to lie upon the table should be persisted in, he *would vote for it*, though he would PREFER (!) to meet the question in some form which could, *by no possibility*, be deemed either EQUIVOCAL OR EVASIVE!"

And in Pinckney's celebrated *Gag* resolution, in the House of Representatives, May 6th, 1836, General Pierce voted in the affirmative. It is as follows:

"Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions, or papers, relating *in any way*, or to *any extent whatever*, to the subject of Slavery or the abolition of Slavery, shall, without being either printed or referred, be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

ENFORCEMENT OF THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.—Under the provisions of the act of the last Legislature, Mr. Lathrop, on yesterday, made claim, before Justice Fry, to a negro man, brought by him to this State in 1849, and who had left him some time since. Upon a hearing and proof of the ownership of property, the negro was turned over to Mr. Lathrop, who has started him to the Atlantic States. Everything passed off with quiet and order—nothing like resistance being made to the due execution of the law.—*Sacramento Union.*

This is the first act under the new law of California, which sets aside the constitutional prohibition of Slavery in that State. Others, doubtless, will follow, and the next step will be, when it is found that the first is submitted to, and approved of, by the people, to re-establish Slavery itself.

☞ THE ANTI-LIQUOR BILL of New Hampshire, which is about the same thing as the Maine Law, passed the House of Representatives, last week, by a decisive vote, and was sent to the Senate. That body also passed it, with an amendment that, in the event of its suspension by the people, its operation should be indefinitely postponed, and not for one year merely, as the bill sent from the House provides. To this, the House refused to agree, and, as the Senate probably will not recede from its amendment, the bill, without doubt, will lay over till another session. To kill the Anti-Liquor Law by such amendment, is the last rum dodge everywhere. The Legislators are unwilling to pass it, and are afraid to reject it, so they got rid of it by stratagem. The Temperance people, however, nowhere seem inclined to give it up so. They will not be satisfied till experience proves the law to be an injudicious one; and if that can not be shown, they will not be content without it.

FREE SOILERS ON PIERCE.—The *Evening Post*, of this city, announces, as tidings worth an especial editorial, that the "democracy of Chicago, Ill., responded with hearty enthusiasm" to the nomination of Pierce and King the day it was made. It also reminds its readers that Chicago gave a decided majority, in 1848, for Van Buren, over either Cass or Taylor; and quotes from the *Democrat*, of that city, "that we have taken particular pains to ascertain the strength of the new nominations, with both the Cass and Van Buren men, and we have not yet found one who is not delighted with the nominations—the Van Buren men especially so."

So of Wisconsin, says the *Post*, which, in 1848, gave Cass, 15,001; Taylor, 13,747; Van Buren, 10,418; the *Waukesha Democrat* remarks that "The Free Soilers, in a body, like true men, respond to the nominees of the Baltimore Convention." The Waukegan *Chronicle*, formerly free soil, "comes out frankly and unequivocally in support of Pierce and King." And the Milwaukie *Wisconsin* says: "There are signs of the times which indidate that, with no offensive mismanagement, the Van Buren vote of '48 may be secured to General Pierce."

So the *Post* vaunteth itself, "and its brethren of Northern Illinois and Wisconsin," and says "we are glad." And no wonder; it is not misery alone that loves company. What would become of the *Post* if there was nobody so contemptible as itself?

## Communications.

### *DENOUNCE NOT THE SLAVE-OWNER.*

O NO, never denounce him! Denounce him not, for he, as well as the slave, is a man and a brother. He is not a fiend, nor a demon; he is not diabolical, nor hellish; but he is God's own, dear, precious child. He is doing wrong, it is true; he is grievously sinning against both his Father, and his Father's children; but for all that, he is none the less himself God's child; and God loves him; God is on his side—yes, He is on his side, in spite of his sin; for He is on his side against his very sin, and to save him out of it. And if he is God's child, then you ought to love him, and to be on his side, and to try to save him from his sin. The fact that he is a sinner, that he is guilty of the most flagrant crimes, is the very reason why you should not denounce him, but why, on the other hand, you should pity him, and treat him kindly, and help him to be better. His sin is his own worst enemy, and you know it, although he does not; and therefore you ought to be his friend, against that enemy. Then never denounce him, but take him to your heart as your own, tender, loving brother, and help him.

Denounce him not, again, for he is only doing what you would do, were you in his place. Had you been always situated as he has been, you would have done precisely what he has done. Had you been born of slave-owning parents, and thus inherited his organization—had you been educated, from the first, as he was, and had you always been, and were you now, surrounded by the same circumstances which have surrounded, and which now surround, him—you would be a slave-owner, just as he is. Yes, this very day, instead of being an Abolitionist, you would be claiming property in human slaves. You would be the very slave-owner we are speaking of. For he is only what influences have made him. Now, if, in your case, precisely the same influences had been brought into operation, you would be exactly what he is: you would be himself. And on the other hand, if he had always been situated as you have been—had he been born, educated and circumstanced like yourself—he would, to-day, be an Abolitionist, just as strong a one as you are, for he would be your own very self! Simple change of places would change you into him, and him into you. The mere circumstances being altered, everything would be altered. Then denounce not the man who differs from yourself only in his circumstances, not in his nature. Denounce not the slave-owner.

O no, my brother! Spare your harsh, unkind, ungenerous words. He whom you are denouncing is a man; and man is a sacred, holy being! There's a beautiful angel in his breast; there's an enshrined Divinity within his mortal form. He only needs culture, development, unfolding, and he will hate the wrong of which he is now guilty, and put an instant end to it. Then deal gently, and tenderly, and lovingly with him, while, at the same time, you fail not to point out to him the terrible nature of his sin. Spare not that, but, because you spare it not, be sure that you spare him; for it is load enough for him to bear, that you charge him, even though most kindly, with so great a crime, without laying on the additional burden of harshness and unbrotherliness toward himself. No, no, spare your denunciations of him. But pity him, love him, help him, be on his side, do him good, make him better.

Abolitionists, editors, lecturers, agents, all Abolitionists, denounce not the guilty slave-owners of the South; denounce not the guiltier slaveholders of the North; denounce none of those who are implicated in the nation's great sin; denounce the things all these do; but as for them, love them, as you do the slaves, and try to save together both them and the slaves.

JOSEPH TREAT.

## Miscellaneous News.

### *THE RESCUE CASES.*

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT.

*Trial of Elizur Wright on the charge of having assisted in the rescue of Frederick Minkins, commonly known as Shadrach.*

FIFTH DAY.....JUNE 9.

Mr. Wright requested permission to introduce to the notice of the Judge, before proceeding with the argument to the jury, a decision of the Supreme Court of Vermont, supporting the right of the jury to judge the law as well as the facts.

The judge said that he could not hear any further remarks on that point, that the decisions of this Court upon it have been such that it must be considered as settled, unless the Supreme Court of the United States should reverse it. Such a reversal he considered very unlikely to be made, as he was acquainted with the opinions of all the Judges of that Court except one, and they agree with his own. He was acquainted with the case which Mr. Wright wished to cite. He had examined the subject very fully, reflected much on it, and was very clear about the correctness of the view he holds. He had permitted Mr. Wright to make his argument yesterday, because he was defending himself, instead of having counsel, and to interrupt him in the course he had laid out might have embarrassed him. But he must consider that part of the argument concluded.

The case which Mr. Wright wished to read from was that of State vs. Joseph Croteau, December Term, 1849, on a charge of violating the license law of 1846. The case came before the full bench on exceptions. The Judges were Hon. Stephen Royce, Chief Judge, and Hon. Milo L. Bennett, Hon. Daniel Kellogg, Hon. Hiland Hall, Assistant Judges. The opinion of the Court was delivered by Judge Hall. Judge Bennett dissented. The report of the trial is of considerable length. The abstract which precedes it contains the following passages:

"By the modern practice of granting new trials in civil suits, for a difference between the Court and the jury upon matter of law, and of allowing bills of exceptions for misdirection of the Judge, juries have become subject to the control of the Court in regard to the law, and are, consequently, now, in such suits, the proper judges of the facts only."

"But in criminal prosecutions, the ancient common law right of the jury, in favour of the prisoner, to determine the whole matter in issue—the law as well as the fact—remains unimpaired."

"The right of a jury to find not only the fact of the issue, but to decide upon its criminality, was, in England, essential to the protection of innocence and the preservation of liberty, and for that reason has been maintained and preserved."

"In criminal trials, it is the *duty* of the Judge to aid the jury by giving them his opinion in regard to the law involved in the issue; and it is the *right* of the jury, in favour of the prisoner, to determine the law as well as the facts by their general verdict."

The two Judges who, in England and this country, have had most influence in establishing the doctrine that the Judges have the exclusive right to decide the law, were Lord Mansfield and Judge Story. The leading English case on that side is that of Rex v. Dean of St. Asaph, 3 Term, R. 429. Judge Hall, when speaking of that case, in the Vermont trial, introduces the following note, which is quite readable:

"One of the principle *authorities* relied upon by Lord Mansfield, in this case, was a ballad, stated to have been written by Mr. Pulteney, who was one of the supporters of the Craftsman, upon the occasion of the acquittal of the publisher of that paper by a jury, in a prosecution conducted by Sir Philip Yorke, Attorney General, about the year 1732. The object of Lord Mansfield was to show that even the opposition to the administration, at that time, of which Mr. Pulteney was the leader, concurred with the government, that the jury, in prosecutions for libel, had nothing to do with questions of law. The stanza from the ballad, as quoted by Lord Mansfield, was as follows:

'Sir Philip well knows that his innendoes
No longer will serve him in verse or in prose,
For twelve honest men have decided the cause,
Who are judges of facts, but not judges of laws.'

It turns out, however, that Lord Mansfield's recollection of the ballad was erroneous, and that, as originally published, it was an authority on the other side of the question, the two last lines being:

'For twelve honest men have decided the cause,
*Who are judges alike of the facts and the laws.*'

29 Par Hist. 582. 5 Camp. Ld. Chan. 50. 6 Ib. 345."

At 20 minutes of 10 o'clock, Mr. Wright resumed his argument to the jury, and finished at 22 minutes past 11. The defence was not such as a lawyer would have thought it expedient to make; it was chiefly historical, intended to show that the Constitution, which is used as a basis for the fugitive slave law, was not framed for such a purpose, but for an entirely different one, and that to use it for such a purpose is a monstrous perversion, not only of history, but of the English language and of all moral principles. The argument was very able, and at times eloquent; but as the largest part of it was published in the *Commonwealth* last winter, and was then read by most of those who would read it at time, we shall not publish it now.

When he had finished his argument to the jury, Mr Wright addressed the Judge on the insufficiency of the last three counts in the warrant, for obstructing the officers, under the act of 1790. The counts do not set forth the offence with which the prisoner in the hands of the officers was charged. It does not appear that the offence alleged was one of which the Commissioner had cognizance. This specification would be necessary in the State Courts, and is still more necessary in the United States Courts, which are established for specific purposes. He also argued that under these counts it could not be sufficient that the person in the hands of the obstructed officers, was alleged to have been a fugitive. He must have been actually a fugitive from service and labour, and the person described in the warrant. If a slave-hunter should come and get out a warrant and on it seize your honour, or Mr. District Attorney Lunt, or Mr. Commissioner Curtis, the officer might be obstructed with impunity. You might knock him down, and this would be the proper course, for under the fugitive slave law there is no other redress. A free man may be adjudged to owe service as well as a slave, and he has no protection if he must depend on the operation of the law.

The judge remarked that the first objection was not clear enough to induce him to stop all the proceedings by quashing the indictment, a course which Judges adopt only in extreme cases and with reluctance; and that if the objection is well founded, it will be available after verdict as well as before, and therefore it was not necessary to investigate it then.

In regard to the second objection, the Judge was still of the opinion which he had before expressed, that it was not necessary to show that the person arrested was actually a fugitive. The warrant requires the officer to perform a certain act, and protects him in its performance.

At a quarter of 12, Mr. Lunt began his closing address, and with the exception of an intermission of perhaps half an hour spoke till a quarter of 2. The Judge then occupied about an hour and a quarter in delivering his charge. We refrain from giving an abstract of Mr. Lunt's address and Judge Curtis' charge, because we hope to give them more fully hereafter than we could now.

The Jury were directed to seal their verdict if they should agree on one, and the Court adjourned till this morning at 9 1-2 o'clock. We do not think there is the least danger of a conviction. If there should be on the case as it went to the Jury, each of the jurymen would deserve to be appointed a fugitive slave Commissioner. But we have some fear they may disagree.

SIXTH DAY.....JUNE 10.

The jury came in at 9 1-2 o'clock and answered to their names. To the question whether they had agreed to a verdict, the foreman said they had not. The Judge asked whether their difference of opinion arose from difference of views as to any of the points of law involved in the case; or from the views they entertained on the effect of the evidence? The foreman said that the difference arose not on any point of law, but on the effect of the evidence. The Judge then asked whether there was any probability that they could agree on a longer conference? The foreman answered that there was not. The Judge then directed the papers in the hands of the jurors to be received from them. This was discharging them from the consideration of the case, and considering that it was given them at 3 o'clock the preceding afternoon, we thought their discharge exhibited considerable decision and promptness.

Mr. Lunt then stated to the Court that as the jury could not agree on such evidence as had been placed before them, he would not proceed with any more of the rescue cases at present. The Court therefore took up a civil case, retaining the same jurymen, with the exception of three, who were permitted to retire on account of fatigue, and the witnesses in the rescue cases were notified that they would not be required to attend again until they should receive further notice.

We understand that the jury stood ten or eleven for conviction, and two or only one for acquittal. This, to most of those who heard the testimony, caused great surprise. But what is surprising in jurors which at the commencement of a trial, give favourable answers to such questions as were put to these? This packing system excluded nearly all of those who were summoned, that had sufficient manhood and intelligence to be competent jurors.—*Boston Commonwealth.*

DURING the week ending the 5th inst., there were 139 deaths from Cholera in New Orleans.

——VISITORS are flocking to Newport, in unwanted number. The Boston *Post* says they take their "medicine chests" with them.

——THE LOCOFOCO members of the New Hampshire Legislature have postponed, until after the Presidential election, the choice of a Senator in place of John P. Hale.

——COMMANDER FORBES, whose name has been before the American public in connection with Liberian affairs, died on 25th March, on board the ship-of-war Tortoise, on the passage to St. Helena, whither he was proceeding for the benefit of his health.

——"You cover a great deal in your resolutions," said a gentleman in Washington to a returning Delegate. "Yes," said the chap, "we would have backed up Christianity as well as other things, but we had a Jew on the Platform Committee, and he staved it off."

——THE amount of "material aid" from various sources received by Gov. Kossuth since he left Massachusetts, is $7,523. The whole amount raised in this country is about $90,000.

——PHEBE WAY graduated in December last, with seven others, at the Pennsylvania College of Medicine, instituted for the instruction of females in the medical art, and has come to Baltimore to enter upon the practice and duties of a regular physician.

——WE learn from a physician just from St. Louis, says *The Galena Jeffersonian*, that the cholera, in a fatal form, is existing in that city, and that, although nothing is said of it in the papers, numbers die daily, both among the passengers on boats and residents.

——ONE of Virginia's Representatives in Congress (Fayette McMullen), having got into an altercation on a Delaware steamboat and broken his cane over his opponent's head, is now under $1,000 bail to appear at Philadelphia and answer for the assault.

——THROAT DISEASE IN MAINE AND MASSACHUSETTS.—A Massachusetts paper says it is reported that the books of one "town agent," who is authorized to sell liquor for sacramental purposes and for sickness, show that twenty-four thousand persons in the vicinity have been taken "sick" the past year.

——PARSON BROWNLOW, Editor of the *Son of Temperance*, at Knoxville, Tenn., is so hard upon *Christian liquor sellers* and *drinkers*, that some of the officers refuse the use of their church for meetings at which he is to speak. A Division at Campbell's Station invited him to deliver a speech for them, which he accepted. The Old School Presbyterian church was procured for the occasion; but on learning that Bro. Brownlow was to speak, the officers of the church positively refused its use.

——THE *National Democrat*, published at Cassopolis, Mich., says of a distinguished personage: "He sustained the Compromise measures, therefore he is not a wicked man." This must be agreeable (adds the *Tribune*), to a considerable number of gentlemen who have hitherto been more sure of their adherence to those measured than of their own moral goodness.

——THE Boston *Journal* having represented General Pierce to be "a lineal descendant of the family of the Percys, and the Duke of Northumberland," an exchange paper appends what Shakspeare puts into the mouth of one of their contemporaries:

PRINCE HENRY.—"I am not yet of Percy's mind, the Hotspur of the north, he that kills me some six or seven dozen of *Scots* at a breakfast, washes his hands, and says to his wife, '*Fie upon this quiet life, I want work.*'"

——COL. SETH J. THOMAS, of Charlestown, was nominated by Governor Boutwell, as Inspector of the Massachusetts States Prison, but the council rejected him. Colonel Thomas was the counsel for the owner of the fugitive slave Sims.

——ADDRESS TO THE FREE COLOURED POPULATION OF MARYLAND.—The Baltimore *American* of the 16th. inst., contains the following: The committee appointed at the recent meeting of the free coloured population of this city, held in St. James' African Episcopal church, for the purpose of calling a convention of delegates from the free coloured population of the State, have issued an address to the free coloured people of the State, explaining the object for which the meeting was held, and earnestly impressing upon them the importance of appointing delegates to represent them in the convention to be held in this city on the 25th of July next, for the purpose of "taking into serious consideration their present condition and future prospects in this country, and to contrast them with the inducements and prospects opened to them in Liberia or any other country." The address says: "As the object for which this convention is called, is one of vital importance to the free coloured people of Maryland, it is greatly to be desired, and confidently expected, that a full attendance of delegates will be present on the occasion, who will calmly, deliberately and intelligently consider the object for which they have been called together, and that each delegate will come prepared to contribute his portion of information, and fully and freely to express his views on the great subject of our future destiny."

——FORENSIC CRITICISM.—We (*Post*) will be particularly obliged to any person who may happen to make a speech during this campaign, in which no reference is made to the unfurling of banners, or spreading any articles of that description to the breeze, if they will have the kindness to send us a copy. We wish to see how such a political speech would look.

We are authorized to offer a suitable reward to any person who will invent an acceptable figure of speech to take the place of this fanner during the approaching campaign—and we will promise him a reasonable share of immortality besides, if successful. The same reward will be offered for any substitute for the "Ship of State." Even a partial substitute would be well-paid for, and be a great relief to the country.

——RETURN OF A FREE COLOURED BOY FROM

## Miscellaneous Department.

*For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.*

### Horicon.*

Wild mere, upon thy bosom deep and still,
Far from the meanness and the feverish strife
Of life, how soon I could forget all ill
And sorrow in the world forever rife.

All malice here I soon could quite forget—
Here where life's low desires and passions cease,
And 'neath the solemn gaze of nature yet
Could yield myself into the arms of peace.

The white stag here at noon-day drinks his fill,
By brooklets black with hemlock's dropping dew:
Then far o'er hazy hills, to fresher still,
He wanders, and to well-springs wild and new.

The drowsy wavelets, crinkling, ever run
Over the noiseless sands of silver here,
And the white waterfowl, far in the sun,
Lies dreaming on the dim and glimmering mere.

And out upon its silent bosom far,
The water-flowers in snowy clusters sleep,
And give their sweetness to the winds that are
In sunshine wandering o'er its slumberous deep.

There ever, at the rosy morning hour,
Where rests the wave, or in green eddies whirls,
Linked light from leaf to leaf—from flower to flower—
The gossemer hangs heavy with its pearls.

The birdlet brown o'erjoyed, wild forest-child,
With its own music warbles in the sun,
And having sung all changes sweet and wild,
Returns unto the theme it had began.

On yon Dark Mountain slow and dreamily
The great, broad shadows in the sunshine die,
And soft, deep shadows in each moveless tree
Like a green twilight here forever lie.

When down o'er all these hills and dells and isles,
The slumberous twilight lowers like a dream,
We wonder if the world that round us smiles
Is real, or to fancy do but seem.

Wild mere, if ne'er I gaze upon thee more,
Still, here, or wandering far in foreign lands,
Thy beauty all is mine—thy lovely shore—
These hours of peace upon thy silent sands.

H. W. G.

*The Indian name of Lake George, signifying "Clear Water."

Mr. N. P. Willis, as well known in New York as "a man about town" as he is everywhere else—where Fame blows her trumpet—as a distinguished literary character, has been travelling, for the benefit of his health, for several months past, in the West India Islands. What he has seen, and thought worthy of note, he has communicated, in a series of letters, to his paper, *The Home Journal*, and has even taken the risk of ruining his reputation, as a man of fashion, by looking at the negro race in those islands as veritable human beings, and not as mere man-monkeys Whether he will be hissed at the Opera, *tabooed* at his Club, banished from the Paradise of "above Bleecker," or what other calamity may await him, for publishing the following letter, we will not venture to predict. It is fortunate he has no political aspirations, as it would damn him incontinently. A man who could see beauty and recognise style in a black woman, and speak of a coloured man, in any station, as any thing but a "nigger," would not be held as a safe repository of our Republican Institutions. His remarks upon the coloured people of Martinique are candid, interesting and valuable.

Martinique, *April*, 1852.

Dear Morris: I will commence my letter, I believe, with introducing you to a *belle* of a new colour—my Hon. friend and myself having just been presented to a jet-black young lady, who is "in the best of society" of Fort Royal (the seat of Government, twenty miles from here), and who is said to be more admired, by the French officers stationed there, than any other lady on their visiting list. Of that city of ten thousand inhabitants, Mademoiselle Juliette Célestine, we were assured, is quite the fashionable young lady most attended to.

I do not give you (you observe) the patronymic or surname of Mademoiselle Juliette. As far as I could make it out, she has none—and upon this point I was a little troubled, till I recalled an explanation of it in Breen's work on these islands. He states it as a peculiarity of the negro, that they *refuse to be enslaved to any particular name*. Let me quote the conclusion of his remarks on the subject:

"Nor is this corruption of the language (by the negroes) confined to mere words; it extends also to proper names; so much so, indeed, that there are few persons on the island that are not designated by any name but their own. Some have the *sobriquet* of Moncoq, Montout, Fanfax, Laquerre. Others have their names mollified by means of certain dulcet, endearing terminations: thus Anne becomes *Anzie*; Catharine *Catiche*; Bessie *Bessonnete*; whilst the greatest number, dropping altogether the names given them at the baptismal font, have adopted others of more modern vogue. Jean Baptiste is supplanted by *Nelson*; François, by *Francis*; Cyprien, by *Camille*; and, what is still more preposterous, not only are the Christian names altered in this way, but *the patronymics of many are entirely suppressed*. Monsieur Jean Marie Beauregard considers Jean Marie too vulgar, and adopts the name of Alfred; and his friends consider Beauregard too long, and omit it altogether in their dealings with him. By this process, M. Jean Marie Beauregard is metamorphosed into plain *M. Alfred*; and his wife, if he have any, goes by the style and title of *Madame Alfred*. This confusion of names would be merely ludicrous, if it were not pregnant with mischief to the community. From being first sanctioned in the intercourse of every-day life, and introduced into family circles, the alterations and substitutions had gradually crept into the more serious relations of trade and litigation; so that, when the Commissioners of Compensation were about to adjudicate upon the claims and counter-claims from St. Lucia (the neighbouring island), scarcely a single individual was found to have preserved his *proper name* in the different documents submitted on his behalf. Difficulty and delay were the result; and many persons only succeeded in establishing their identity and securing their property by obtaining affidavits, certificates of baptism, and notarial attestations, at considerable expense."

Mademoiselle Juliette Celestine (whose name is entitled to your respect, with this explanation) is an intimate friend of our fair hostess, and it was to this happy chance that we owed the privilege of a presentation to her. She was in town for a few days, and had called, yesterday; and, on Madame Stephanie's mentioning, this morning at breakfast, that she was to call again to-day, we so expressed ourselves as to be sent for on her arrival.

M'lle Juliette is of the blood that does not thin with the climate, as do the whites. She is about nineteen, and as plump as Hebe—her original model from Nature apparently just perfected. Her skin, though as black a one as I ever saw, is fine-grained and lustrous, and her shoulders (there was no denying) quite beautiful. The gorgeous-coloured Madras turban covered her forehead to the eyebrows, and, with a long sweep of twisted fold over the cheek, concealed the hair—the lace hem of her snowy chemise being the next downward interruption to the lines of rounded ebony. Her features are strictly African—the lips full, and the nose of that degree of flatness which is only affectionate, and which I take to be the highest expression of this shape in contradistinction to the more repelling aquiline. Her eyes would have been beautiful if there had been anything white in the neighbourhood with which to contrast them—but black eyes on so black a ground were "coals to Newcastle." They had one fine quality, however; they had never been contracted with a suspicion, or a withdrawal of confidence, or an attempt to understand anything that did not speak for itself; and they were, consequently, as tranquilly open as the cups of two water-lilies. Her smile was of the same never-startled confidingness—coming and going with the ease of a shadow—and her teeth were only too white and perfect for any piquancy of expression No jeweller could have cut them more evenly out of pearl. Her little fat black hands were daintily tapered, and looked ladylike. She wore large rings, and these, with her heaps of gold chains and the enormous gold earrings, which they call *cinq-clous*, made a sort of barbaric glitter, with her lively gestures and expressive motions of the head, which seemed to me very picturesque. I was pleased, by the way, with the consistency with which she adhered to the dress and ornaments exclusively worn by those of her own colour. The *cinq-clous* ear-rings, particularly—masses of solid gold, resembling five small kegs welded together by the sides—are seen in every respectable black ear, never in a white one. It would have been natural and reasonable for her, considering her means and social position, to have graced her beauty with some of the French fashions, abundantly within reach and worn by the Creole ladies with whom she associates.

Mademoiselle Juliette's reception of us was politely cordial and entirely without embarrassment. It seemed odd to us, at first, to hear the French, which we consider an accomplishment, come so fluently and elegantly from a mouth of that colour, but it heightened the novelty and charm of her impression. After a little talk upon climates, conversation turned upon the usages of our ladies, and the differences of etiquette in our different countries, and she laughed immoderately at some of the American distinctions between propriety and impropriety in female manners. Love of fun seemed to be her uppermost quality, and her own views and notions, though entirely modest and delicate, were a singular mixture of frankness and droll mockery. I could easily see how the French officers at Fort Royal might find a constant pleasure in her society. Our visit ended with an examination of her monstrous ear-rings (for which she held her cheek toward us with the simplicity of a child), and, with an exchange of souvenirs between her and myself—I giving her my watch-guard, and she giving me two berries of the acajou tree, which she carried as charms in her pocket. My friend and I agreed that we had made a charming call, and that Mademoiselle Juliette Celestine was a memorable addition (of a new colour) to our acquaintance.

I have made many inquiries as to the comparative social position of the blacks and whites on the island. The distinctions of colour are fast giving way. The French, as we know by our Indian history, amalgamate, more easily than any other nation, with whatever race they fall among, and there are families of blacks who have the entire freedom of the best society of Martinique. There is a difference, however, in this respect, between the large commercial and fashionable capital of St. Pierre, and the smaller town of Fort Royal, which is the seat of Government. The *official* orders are, to allow no distinctions to be made; and the Governor's balls and parties, and those of the officers and civic functionaries, are attended as numerously by blacks as by whites. In St. Pierre, there is still a reluctance to admit coloured persons into society; and the discontent whice this creates has almost put a stop to the gayeties of the town. If an exclusively white party is given, the blacks of the lower orders collect around the doors, and make such disturbances as effectually to interrupt the pleasure of the evening. With the constant dread of insurrections, and the memory of the massacre of whites which occurred a few years since, the inhabitants do not feel safe in defying these interruptions of their comfort. It is a recent triumph of the blacks, that the famous and aristocratic convent of this place has been compelled to admit coloured young ladies, if offered as pupils. Another triumph has been added to this, in the shape of a result of a matter of some scandal. A wealthy planter, when dying, a year or more since, recommended to the special care of his young wife, a negro youth, one of his manumitted slaves, who had been his favourite. The black boy, after a month or two, was found dining at his mistresses table, and it was at this point of intimacy that her aristocratic relatives interfered and made their greatest opposition and remonstrance. The course of time, however, brought about more serious proofs of intimacy, and then the relatives gave up opposition, the matter was compromised, and the planter's widow and her manumitted slave were very recently married, with all the usual forms and ceremonies. The whole affair is still a lively topic of Martinique gossip.

An introduction, kindly offered us, to Monsieur Bissette, the negro representative from Martinique to the National Assembly at Paris, has been prevented by his recent illness. The history of this now celebrated man is dramatic enough to be remembered. A tract which he wrote upon the hardships of the negro slaves in the colonies, drew upon him the hostility of the local government, and he was arrested, tried, branded, and condemned to the galleys. On arriving in France, an able lawyer, feeling a sympathy in his case, undertook to procure him a new trial at Paris. He succeeded, pleaded his cause, and procured his acquittal. Bissette returned to Martinique in 1848, and his reception by the negroes was the most tumultuous scene ever witnessed in the country. The planters and citizens expected, of course, that in him, they had now, a dangerous and bitter enemy; but on the contrary, his whole course and policy have been to establish a kindly understanding between the whites and blacks of the island. As Representative and citizen, he has shown himself, every way, a man of enlarged and liberal philanthropy. A class of the blacks has fallen off from supporting him, naturally; but in the general esteem of the inhabitants, of both colours, he stands higher, perhaps, than any other man.

The negro's *inordinate and uncontrollable love of change* is the greatest obstacle which philanthropists find in the way of bettering his condition. Physiologists say it is a quality in his blood. He is constant to nothing which he can set aside. The law has lately made an attempt to correct this fickleness, as far as it effects service in families and on plantations. Since emancipation, it has been found impossible to retain them, except for a little time in each new place; and labourers often occasioned great loss to the planter by suddenly leaving him when his crop was ripe on the ground and needed immediate harvesting. The new law compels a written agreement for every term of service, and binds both parties, by heavy penalties, to adhere to it. New servants and labourers are not to be employed without a certificate, from the last place, that these conditions have been fulfilled. All this excites great discontent, among them, however.

A curious proof of the negro love of novelty was mentioned to us by a most intelligent gentleman who has resided twenty years on the island. They work on estates where there are usually as many females as males, but they never form intimacies on the estates where they live. They must have their temporary wives on plantations three or four miles off; and thither they go, nightly, at both great inconvenience and great danger—the walk after dark, and the return before daylight, exposing them to the venomous snakes which sleep coiled upon the roads, and the fatigue being a heavy addition to their day's labour. This evil, however, will disappear gradually before the growing ambition to be "respectable"—the first step of which, usually, is to marry legally and legitimatize children. They then become extremely punctilious and etiquettical, never addressing each other without "Monsieur" and "Madame," and going through all forms and ceremonies with ludicrous pertinacity and gravity. Breen makes some remarks on these points which are valuable, from his well-weighed knowledge of the race:

"Amongst the numerous peculiarites of the negro character, as it is moulded or modified by French society, is their constant aping of their superiors in rank. During Slavery, the most venial offence, the most innocent familiarity, was regarded as an "*insolence*," and, all the year round, the din of "*Je vous trouve bien insolent*," resounded in the negro's ear From long habit this expression has now become a byword with the lower orders: it is, in fact, the staple of their abuse of each other, and the most opprobrious epithet in their Billingsgate vocabulary. *Canaille* is deemed too vulgar, and *négreville* too personal; while "*in-so-lent*" carries with it a pungency which receives added zest from the recollections of the past.

"But if, to be deemed *insolent* is the lowest step of degradation, to be held *respectable* is the highest step in the ladder of social distinctions. Nothing can be more amusing than to observe the talismanic effect of this word upon the lower orders; even the common street-criers take advantage of it in the disposal of their wares. Some time ago a female servant, being commissioned to sell a quantity of biscuits of inferior quality, hawked them about to the cry of "*biscuits pour les dames respectables*." As she passed along the street, the conceited recommendation did not fail to attract the attention of those for whom it was thrown out. The hawker was stopped at every door, and so great was the anxiety of the negresses to test the quality of her biscuits as a patent of respectability, that, before she had reached the end of the street, she had disburdened herself of the contents of her tray.

"The negro's pretensions to respectability are founded more upon the contrast between himself and the European labourer, than upon any positive good qualities that he can lay claim to. In some points there is a decided superiority on his side. His person and his hut, apart from the influence of the climate, are cleaner than those of the white peasant; his holiday dress more stylish, and his gait and attitudes less clumsy and clownish: but he is surpassed by the white man in the more solid qualities of industry and perseverance. A negro espies his fellow at the end of the street, and, rather than join him in a *tete-à-tete*, he will carry on a conversation with him for several hours at the top of his voice, to the unspeakable annoyance, perhaps the scandal, of those who may occupy the intermediate houses. Should the wind blow off his hat, and warn him to depart, he will continue the conversation, and let some one else pick it up for him; or, if he condescend to notice the occurrence, he turns round, with an air of offended dignity, puts his arms a-kimbo, takes a quiet look at the hat as it rolls along, shrugs up his left shoulder, and walks leisurely after it, until it meets with some natural obstruction.

"The general character of the French negro, physical, moral and social, may be summoned up in a few words. His person is well proportioned, his movements are brisk, his carriage easy, without stiffness or swagger. His disposition is uncommonly gay and good-humoured; he is always singing or whistling when compatible with his actual occupation. He is submissive, but never obsequious; and, though born and bred in Slavery, there is not a trace of servility in the outward man. Unlike the European peasant, who seldom presents himself before a clean coat without a feeling of crawling degradation, the French colonial negro is polite to a point; he can touch his hat to any one, but he will not uncover himself in the open air, even for the Governor of the colony. He is docile, intelligent and sober; active, but not laborious; superstitious, but not religious; addicted to thieving without being a rogue; averse to matrimony, yet devoted to several wives; and, though faithful to neither, he can scarcely be deemed debauched. His friendship is sincere, his gratitude unbounded, and his generosity to all about him only surpassed by his affectionate attachment to his children. In him the undisciplined character of the African is tempered by the accident of his birth. He is, in short, a compound of savageness and civilization—the rude production of the desert, transplanted to a more genial soil, and polished off, externally, by the decencies and humanizing contact of English and French society; but without that culture, in religion and education, which alone can impart either weight or moral dignity to the social man."

This was written, you will remember, some years ago, and, with the progress since, it is to be read with some grains of difference. Of the *present* state of the advance class of the negro race in these islands, Mademoiselle Juliette and Monsieur Bissette may be to you very fair points of estimate and comparison—one social, the other political. In this respect, what I have put together may be of some value, and I believe I will confine this letter altogether to the *coloured* topic, and close where I am.

Yours truly, N. P. W.

### VOLUNTEER APOSTLES.

One of the most astonishing features of the present age is the immense amount of credulity which exists amongst the people of countries the most educated, amidst all the light and knowledge that we boast of over our ancestors. It matters little that the prognostications and promises of one pretended prophet after another drop into nothing; the very potsherds of their fallacies are picked up and kept as precious and complete vessels, sound and without crack or flaw. It matters nothing that the most complete exposures of fanatics and impostors are frequently made; most frequently by themselves. Fresh gudgeons are ever ready to bite at the barest hook. The same principle which gives succes to Francis Moore, gentleman, and to Zadkiel, in Almanacs, sends shoals of believers after any man who chooses to play the founder of a new sect. The same weakness of the human mind which enriches the quack in physic, gives an easy triumph to the quack in faith.

There is scarcely a country in Europe which has not, even in modern times, had a number of religious quack-adventures to show; but the singularity is, that their success is always in proportion to the freedom of inquiry, and to the abundant means of hearing and examining the truth. In Italy, Matheo di Casale, who, in the present century, gave himself out as the Messiah; and, in 1805, managed with much ingenuity to crucify himself, and to hang himself out of his chamber window on a cross, in the public street, attracted no followers. But, in Sweden, the singular outbreak of what was called the Preaching Epidemic, in 1842, notwithstanding the existence of Protestantism, produced the strangest vagaries amongst the peasantry of Smoland and was with difficulty put down. In Lutheran Germany, the most marvellous demonstrations of religious imposture have appeared, and been attended with incredible success. In Jöllenbeck, towards the close of the last century, there were two shoemaker-families who gave themselves out as the families who were to produce the true Messiah; and they found a considerable number of disciples, who were by no means daunted though the promised Shiloh, like that of our own Johanna Southcott, never appeared. But the most extraordinary infatuation was that which the notorious Rosenfeld contrived to excite and maintain, for many years, in Prussia, in the very capital itself, and in the country contiguous to it. As this is comparatively unknown here, we may take a brief glance at it, before directing the reader's attention to certain persons and things which are flourishing in London and in the country near it, at the present moment.

In the middle of the eighteenth century there might have been seen in the Ackermark, in Prieg-nitz, and also in the neighbouring country of Mecklenburg, a wandering man, who, in dress and appearance, was not much removed from a beggar. He never, however, begged, except for a single glass of water, or for a night's lodging. He appeared to accept this hospitality chiefly that he might enter into conversation with those whose guest he was; and who were, for the most part, shepherds, whom he met with in the fields, or day-labourers, or weavers who lived in remote and solitary places.

In the earlier part of his career he wore a green gamekeeper's coat: which, being much worn and torn, gave him more of the beggar's look. His appearance had something in it suspicious, and even fearful. His countenance was pale, and of an earthly hue; his eyes were set deep in his head, and his whole body had a loose and flabby appearance. People, however, were not afraid of him as of a thief who sought a lodging in order to disappear in the morning with booty. His keeper's coat was the relic of a former service with the Markgraf of Schwedt.

He carried no money, and wore a long beard on his chin, which proclaimed him a prophet. He would suddenly step into the hut of a herdsman with a biblical greeting; cast his eyes towards Heaven as he received an answer, turn his back, and sigh. The herdsman would probably not see him again for a year. But he did not depart in such haste where his salutation was received as he wished. Where he found the right ground for the seed, tinder for the sparks, which he wished to shed, he entered into long conversations on religion. He was not, however, such a fanatic as to rush rashly into a revelation of his extraordinary schemes. He waited the proper time and opportunity for these, and knew how to preserve a discreet silence when he perceived that the faith of his hearers was weak.

In 1765 he appeared in the country of Prenzlow, in the undisguised fervour of fanaticism. His appearance was still more wretched than before; his eye more wild. He was now the prophet, who, through long meditation, had arrived at the gift for which his soul thirsted. He entered the cottage of a shepherd in Dedelow, asked for a draught of water, and, holding aloft the cup, exclaimed to the man and his wife, in an impressive tone, "Children! if you only knew who I am!" When they asked who he might be, he replied, "I am the messenger of God, sent forth to seek his sheep, and gather them into the fold. The prophet, Micah iv. 8, has duly announced me: 'O, Tower of Eder! thou stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee the Golden Rose shall come, even the former dominion, the kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem.'" The simple creatures believed him; they became his firm disciples, and continued unshaken in their faith, even after his bold prophecy of wonders to come in the year 1770 had totally failed.

Rosenfield was no longer the wandering vagabond whom some ridiculed, and whom others received and assisted out of compassion. His name flew far and wide over the Prussian plains; he had very soon a large community of believers, who took care that he needed for nothing. He denounced the wickedness of the world—a safe and perpetual theme. He proceeded then to anathematise Frederick the Great, as the Great Dragon of the Apocalypse, and the clergy as impostors, because they preached death, which he denied to exist for the faithful. He promised his believers immortality, and they believed him, although they saw his disciples dying every day. At last he proclaimed himself to be the true Messiah, and blasphemously asserted that Our Saviour was only an impostor. His followers believed everything. In Berlin, there were numbers of these; but the chief scene of his success was at Biesenthal, about eighteen miles from Berlin, a place at that time as completely removed from the notice of the capital as if it had been distant a hundren leagues. Here he acted the part of a German Mahomet. He kept up a determined warfare with the clergy; ruled his flock of shepherds, shoemakers and weavers, with arbitrary power, and lived in the luxury of never-failing offerings of the good things of this world. He demanded seven maidens—daughters of his chief adherents—to be given up to him, declaring that they had been chosen in connection with the seven seals of the Book of Life, from the foundations of the world. They were at once brought to him. He treated them with the most atrocious cruelty, compelling them with stripes and indignity to perform menial services for him. Some of them ran away to their parents; but the infatuated people drove them back again to their tyrant, and he declared them doomed to utter perdition if they again attempted to abscond. Government eventually was compelled to interfere, and Rosenfeld was imprisoned. But here he assumed so mild a bearing, and conducted himself with so much propriety, that he won over not only the jailer, but one of the city magistrates, who interfered and got him set at liberty. Once abroad again, he retured to all his extravagances with redoubled wildness, and was again shut up. But this only augmented the zeal of his followers; and it was long after his death before the delusion died away.

If these things are wonderful in other countries, how much more wonderful are they in our own and in America, where the people are accustomed to read, talk, and discuss every subject with an unconstrained freedom, which we might naturally expect would leave few lurking-places for ignorance and superstition. Yet how marvellous have been, of late years, the displays of popular credulity in the British race on both sides of the Atlantic! Johanna Southcott, Mad Thom of Kent, Miller, and Joe Smith, have all shown how multitudinous are the people who will still believe in anything or anybody. The Millerites sold their effects, closed their shops; the young women clothed themselves in white, and sat upon their trunks, confidently expecting to float up to heaven with all their luggage, on the day when Miller declared that the world would end. It did not end on that day—but no matter: it was only because there was an error in the calendar.

Mormonism is a grand triumph of credulity. Little did Solomon Spalding dream that his romance of The Manuscript found would, under the unblushing rascality of Smith and Rigdon, erect a church of tens of thousands, and establish a second Turkey at the Great Salt Lake. The prodigies of Momonism, however, have had their historians as well as their prophets: let us now devote a few strokes of the pen to an apostle and his flock a little nearer home.

There is a neat little watering-place which may be found by descending the Thames, and which Londoners find convenient for a few days' visit in summer. We may as well call this spot Periwinkle Port as give it any other name. In this little place—which looks like half a town, the other half of which has been swallowed up by the sea; and where all the remaining houses seem to be looking in astonishment after the missing ones—there may be seen, on fine summer Sundays, a man with a large umbrella, slowly stalking along the street, which is bounded on one side by the houses, and on the other by the sea. His attention is fixed successively on every house as he passes, as if he were on the look-out for lodgings; but not so; he is in quest of the lodgers. If he finds a window open (and in fine weather they are all open), he stops, and in a low, solemn voice, announces to those inside that brother Goosetrap Witness is going to preach at three o'clock on the green.

"Who is brother Goosetrap Witness?" ask the visitors, who are drinking in floods of sea-air, watching the distant steamers through telescopes, and thinking much more of the health of the body than of the health of the soul. "Who is brother Goosetrap Witness, and what has he got to say worth walking out in the heat for?"

"Oh, a dangerous man, sir! a dangerous man," says the landlady, who is just come in to tell them when the church service begins. "O, a very dangerous, audacious man! Turns all the poor people's heads here; frightens the servant girls till they can't sleep of nights; says all the clergy are wicked impostors; won't have any doctors to his silly disciples, and says nobody is a Christian but himself and his dupes."

"And do the people believe him?"

"Ay, that they do, by hundreds; they swear by him; he goes all round the country, and the silly geese come from all round the country to hear him."

"Upon my word," say the visitors, "it is worth while to hear him for once;" and away they go.

Mounted on a chair on the green, with the sea rolling its fresh billows just by, they find a short, somewhat broadset man, of a lean and swarthy aspect, standing with his hymn-book in his hand, in the midst of a group of people, mostly of the labouring classes. The outer circle appears a miscellaneous collection of fishermen and mechanics. The inner one of the more especial Goosetrappists, bearing unmistakeable evidence of being chiefly agricultural labourers, and their wives and daughters and sisters. These are part of the perambulatory church that accompeny their head on these excursions, and enliven his appearances with their hymns. They appear very modest in their demeanour, and some of them very good-looking; all, undoubtedly, perfectly sincere in their faith in what brother Witness tells them, and perform their vocal duty with sufficient skill.

Directing your chief attention to brother Goosetrap Witness, you behold a man of, perhaps, fifty years of age, as we have said, with a whalebony, wiry, swarthy visage, and black hair, worn somewhat thin by time. His small, dark eyes peer forth with a keen but composed inquiry from beneath a pair of strong, dark, shaggy eyebrows, and one of those large, coarse mouths, which are equally common to great eaters and great talkers, bespeaks a possessor of what is called "the gift of the gab." Altogether, the countenance and the man are strongly expressive of a domineering and pertinacious will, of a coarse, strong sense, rather than prominent talent; but of a close, scheming, and onward boring character. There is that assumed look of sanctity which such men commonly wear, but under it you can readily detect an amount of self-esteem, that would make its owner insensible to any degree of contempt.

His dress and air are those of a shoemaker,—as, in fact, he is; and it is a singular circumstance that no craft has furnished so many field-preachers and enthusiasts as that of St. Crispin. George Fox was a shoemaker; Jacob Behmen was a shoemaker; the two families of Jöllenbeck, which were so conspicuous there in the strange heresy, were shoemakers; Matheo di Casale was a shoe-maker; and, amongst the religious fermentations, some of them of an extraordinary character, of late years, in Prussia and Saxony, and especially in Pomerania, the Mark, and Lower Silesia, the chief actors have been shoemakers, weavers, and tailors—all people of sedentary trades. The agricultural labourers, smiths, bricklayers, carpenters, and all the followers of pursuits of greater physical activity, have stood aloof. The only exceptions being shepherds, whose solitary life is calculated to affect the imagination, and whose employment is almost as inactive as that of the sitting trades.

The sort of discourse which our visitors would hear from brother Witness, we shall anon make the reader acquainted with, from our own experience; for, hearing his fame on all hands, during a few days' sojourn in the little half-town of Periwinkle Port, we determined to pay him a visit at his proper domicile and work-a-day tabernacle, which is found in the little quiet market-town of Gudgeon-Brook. A pleasant walk over pleasant fields brought us—that is, a party of some four or five ladies and gentlemen—to Gudgeon-Brook. Advancing up its clean and very quiet streets, we made due inquiries for the whereabouts of brother Goosetrap Witness; an inquiry which produced a sensation. We were directed onward and onward, and behind us we could perceive groups issuing from the houses, and looking after us with much curiosity, and at the same time engaged in earnest conversation. No doubt, they set us down for brethren and sisters of the faith, and concluded that the influence and renown of brother Goosetrap Witness were spreading farther and farther.

We soon found brother Witness's locale, house, chapel, workshop, all congregated in a little court. A rent in a boot was the ostensible object of the visit, but this did not deceive the shrewd perception of brother Witness. He evidently attributed our arrival to the spread of his fame. I was soon accommodated with a seat, and a disciple of a most taciturn and mysterious manner began to operate on the boot. Brother Witness devoted his exclusive attention to the rest of the company, who were furnished with chairs in the court, and was soon afloat in an ocean of doctrine and declamation. From my taciturn operator, who bore a most laughable likeness to an old acquaintance of ours, little was to be extracted but sighs and nods of the head of deep meaning; but another disciple, while he gave hearty thumps to the leather on his knee, and vigorous twitches of his taching-end, afforded me considerable insight into the Goosetrap creed. He blessed the Lord that nothing on earth could hurt him, while he was faithful. Neither fire, nor robbers, nor sickness, nor poverty, nor any evil could come near him; for he was the Lord's; he had his promises, and they could not fail. Neither flames could burn him, nor gun shoot him, nor water drown him, nor rope hang him, nor knife pierce him—"bless the Lord for it!" Brother Witness also declared that he had lately run a nail an inch long into his foot: that to other people not in the faith it might have been fatal, and have most likely produced lock-jaw; but as for himself, he had never looked at the wound; it might have bled; he could not say—he knew that it could not hurt him.

I remarked that they could not in their community require much service from the doctors.

"Doctors! said the man; no, bless the Lord! and praised be his name! never a doctor had ever come within the doors of any of brother Witness's friends! None but unbelievers ever wanted doctors! Christ had commanded his disciples to lay their hands on the sick, and pray for them; anointing them with oil; and they were healed. It was only wickedness and unbelief that kept such things as doctors in the world; if men had been faithful, doctors would long ago have ceased to be heard of."

But, did he believe in miracles taking place now-a-days?

Miracles! Bless the Lord! There are no miracles with him. His word was the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; unbelieving men only called these miracles that were the works of God for his elect. Christians have everything that was promised them of old.

"But where are the Christians," I asked, "that now-a-days find themselves cured by laying on of hands?"

"Where?" said the man, raising his head to its full height, stretching up his neck like a giraffe, and with a swelling chest and expanding nostrils, breathing forth his words in a loud, singing, and inflated tone; "where are they? where are they, indeed? The world calls itself Christian; but it lies in darkness; it believes not, neither doth it the works of faith; and therefore it flies for help to doctors, clergymen, magistrates, soldiers and the like—all empty pitchers that can carry no water—all broken reeds and stubble, to be burnt up with unquenchable fire. The real Christians need no doctors: they have the promises given of old to the saints, and that is enough for them; they are for ever redeemed out of the power of drugs, and pestles and mortars. Nothing can hurt them, and that is the mark of the true believers; that is the difference between them and the empty professors, who are left to suffer many things from many physicians."

"What do you call yourselves, then? Witnesses?"

"Yes, bless the Lord! we are witnesses for the faith on the earth; but we take no name but Christians—that is our name, and none else."

"In fact, I suppose you are the men, and that wisdom will die with you."

"We are the Lord's, praised be his name! but wisdom will not die with us; he will preserve a remnant in the earth for his name's sake."

"But suppose you broke your leg, would you not send for a doctor?"

"Break my leg! bless the Lord! he will never suffer a bone of me to be broken, while I am faithful; he will keep me as the apple of his eye. That is his promise; I have it, and it cannot fail."

In a word, here we had the neucleus of brother Witness's doctrine. He teaches his adherents that all the world is still heathen, in spite of its professions, except himself and his disciples; that the test of being real Christians is the power of working all the miracles that were wrought by the Apostles themselves. But the reader will ask, "Does he do these miracles?" No. "And yet do the people believe him?" Yes. This man in a county bordering on the Metropolis of England—we are talking of a real man, and no shadow; of his real doctrines and practice, and no fictions—this man has taught his doctrine far and wide, and has found so many followers, that we were assured they have now about thirty chapels in different places, and one or more in London itself. He professes to cure all illnesses by the laying on of hands, and by anointing the patient with oil. But *does* he cure them, you ask? He says he does; and the people, when appealed to, say he does. They die, it is true; but nobody lives for ever.

And it is a fact that, not far from this metropolis, there is an extensive sect who never call in medical aid to assist their women in childbirth; who never have their children vaccinated; who, through all the perils of the distempers incident to infancy and childhood, never seek or use the aid of medical science; who, in any case where a surgical operation—nay, even amputation—might relieve suffering, or preserve life, refuse such aid as sinful and superfluous; who, in the most violent acute diseases, or the most contagious fevers, do nothing more, and put faith in nothing more, than the laying on of hands, praying, and anointing with oil. If the sufferer die, "It is the Lord's will:" and that is the all-sufficing phrase!

There is something alarming in the spread of this fanaticism. Some day there may come small-pox of a peculiar virulent type, or a contagious fever, and sweep off a whole population. But when you tell them, they only smile at your unbelieving heathenism. They have already been in danger of a severe legal sentence for the neglect of medical means where death has taken place; but they are ready for the martyrdom of legal or any other persecution, and would flourish under it.

We heard brother Witness deliver one of his open-air Sunday harangues It was precisely of the same style as his journeyman disciple's discourse. All the world was still pagan but Goosetrap Witness and his friends. Brother Witness did not parade much human learning or education. It was all miracle and grace, and very bad grammar.

He declared that the ordinary teachers of Christianity deceived the people by telling them to trust in God, walk orderly, and hope for salvation. "Ah, my brethren!" he added, "there is no hoping and trusting in this thing. Every man knows whether he be in a state of salvation or not. He knows the day and the hour to a minute when salvation was vouchsafed to him; I know, my brethren, the blessed day, to an hour and a minute, when salvation came to me. I was at brother Melksom's, in London, ten years ago. Brother Melksom was always full of rejoicings, singing at heart, like a pilgrim that has cast off his burden, and already sees the golden gates afore him. I found that he had got something that I had not; and I prayed, and prayed, night, and morning, and noon, and morning, and noon, and night; and one morning, at fifty-three minutes and seven and a half seconds past seven o'clock, salvation fell upon me like a cloud of fire. I felt that if I had wings I could have flown at once to Gudgeon-Brook, to tell my friends; but not having them, I hastened down stairs, and said, 'Brother Melksom! we will have some breakfast!'"

The wonderful climax, "Brother Melksom, we will have some breakfast!" seemed to produce an astounding sensation on the auditory. The silent man who had mended the boot, with his ludicrous likeness to an old acquaintance, cast a triumphant look at me across the crowd, saying as plainly as possible, "There! there is no getting over that!" Unfortunately, at this moment, the other disciple who had declared that nothing could hurt him while he was faithful—was seized with a violent fit of ague, or as brother Witness called it, the "agur," and had to be carried off to a neighbouring fisherman's house, where he was in a while somewhat relieved by the laying on of hands—and a potent glass of brandy.

Meantime, brother Witness, at the head of his church, marched off towards a distant village, where he was again, in the evening, to hold a meeting. On the way from the green he recognised me, and triumphantly demanded what I thought of his preaching. I declined to enter into any explanation, further than recommending him, if he really believed in his power of resisting poisons, to try the effect of a few drops of Prussic acid, and if he really was persuaded that he could restore all insane persons, to make a visit to Hanwell or St. Luke's, and put to flight all the demons that afflicted the patients there. If he really possessed such miraculous powers, (I ventured to observe) a glorious work of humanity was open to him. But brother Witness very modestly declined both these tests, under the plea that such experiments would be presumptuous; a sentiment in which I perfectly concurred.

There is an anecdote told which shows how brother Witness has an eye to the main chance. Witness's church holds meetings on a week-day evening, in which every one delivers his sentiment on some subject concerning the welfare of the association. On one occasion, in returning from one of their distant field-preachings, the Goosetrappists found a little foot-bridge carried away by a flood, and their progress homewards thus cut off by the swoolen brook. A new disciple, however, brother Strongback, in his zeal carried the whole company over. It was a fine opportunity for trying how far they could walk on the water, in imitation of the Divine example, which they have the audacity to pretend they have the power to imitate; but on this occasion brother Witness very properly deemed the attempt presumptuous. Brother Strongback carried all safely over, and in gratitude, at the next meeting, one of the faithful stood up and said, "Bless the Lord, and praised be his name! brother Strongback has got no shoes." The above introductory phrase, in which the sacred name is so freely used, is a regular formula, with which every one commences his observations. We need not repeat it, but simply say, that a second brother or sister added, "I will give two-pence for a pair of shoes for brother Strongback." Another would give three-pence; and so it went the round of the meeting. When the necessary sum was subscribed, brother Goosetrap Witness, who had watched the progress of the subscription in silence, arose with great solemnity, and said, "Bless the Lord, and praised be his name, I will make brother Strongback a pair of shoes for the money!"

Again, we ask, will it be believed that at the present moment there is in the vicinity of London, and extending into London itself, a sect whose pretensions are of this preposterous and daring kind?

The lamentable fact, however, is strictly so. Brother Witness of course denounces all books and all reading except of the Bible and the Hymn Book. He and his sect read no books, nor magazines, nor newspapers. Louis Napoleon is not a more rigid enemy of the press than brother Witness.

Surely there is need (and surely brother Witness knows it) of a little more diffusion of education among the clods of the valley in this country. We want either a national or a rational education: something which shall reach the dark corners of the land rather more effectually than the occasional bull's-eye of the policeman. Either education or brother Witness must rule, and the choice lies between them. We must commit the people to the care and sympathies of the educated teacher and the enlightened physician, or they will commit themselves to brother Witness. Joe Smith and brother Witness are the wild growth of uncultivated intellect, and if we are not for general education, we are for—them.—*Dickens' Household Words.*

### MURAT.

Murat was the son of a simple farmer, who kept a country inn at La Bastide, a struggling village in the south of France, fronting the Pyrenees; the inhabitants of whose valleys, strong, intelligent, and adventurous, possess almost the chivalrous genius of Spain, and recall, even among the peasantry, the plebian nobleness and intrepidity of blood of Henri IV. There are, in the South of Europe especially, as there are in Spain, in Scotland, and in the East, tribes of people among whom nobility is found in every rank; where even the mendicant feels the dignity of blood, because he has within him the pride of soul. The young Joachim Murat belonged to one of these tribes. As a child, and as a shepherd, he was strengthened by the rural habits, and by the rough agricultural labours of his family; serving by turns, like his brothers, in the fields, or in his father's *auberge*. He was passionately fond of horses, which,